

BR
1
C 559
V. 5
no. 2

Church History



Vol. V

JUNE, 1936

No. 2

Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
GENERAL LIBRARY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888: REORGANIZED, 1906: INCORPORATED BY ACT OF
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1936

WILHELM PAUCK.....	President
HERBERT WALLACE SCHNEIDER.....	Vice-President
ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.....	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS.....	Treasurer
MATTHEW SPINKA.....	Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON	FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER
EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER	JOHN THOMAS MCNEILL
WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN	SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET	REUBEN E. E. HARKNESS

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
WILHELM PAUCK, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BERNE, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and all other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Berne, Ind., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

BR
1
C559
v. 5
no. 2

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
WILHELM PAUCK, *ex officio*

Vol. V

JUNE, 1936

No. 2

CONTENTS

COVERDALE

James Moffatt 113

LAUD AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

E. R. Adair 121

SERVETUS AND THE GENEVAN LIBERTINES

Roland H. Bainton 141

A CENTURY OF ARMENIAN PROTESTANTISM

Leon Arpeç 150

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF AFRICA

R. Pierce Beaver 168

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY, MARCH, 1936

182

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

184

- BARRACLOUGH, G.: *Papal Provisions*F. W. Buckler
- ARNOLD, (Sir) T. W.: *The Preaching of Islam*F. W. Buckler
- PARKER, R. A.: *A Yankee Saint*W. W. Sweet
- HULL, W. I.: *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker
Migration to Pennsylvania*D. H. Kromminga
- ROBERT OF CLARI, tr. E. T. McNEAL: *The Conquest
of Constantinople*Matthew Spinka
- SWEET, W. W.: *Men of Zeal*A. W. Nagler
- RODABAUGH, J. H.: *Robert Hamilton Bishop*W. W. Sweet
- ALLEN, E. L.: *Kierkegaard: His Life and Thought*, David F. Swenson
- MANROSS, W. W.: *A History of the American Episcopal
Church*J. A. Muller
- LANNING, J. T.: *The Spanish Missions of Georgia*W. Elden Miller
- CALLAHAN, A.: *Medieval Francis in Modern America*
J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.
- FISHER, A. S.: *Lutheranism in Bucks County (Pa.),
1734-1934*Robert Fortenbaugh
- MACFARLAND, C. S.: *Contemporary Christian Thought*
A. C. McGiffert, Jr.
- MURPHY, DU B.: *History of the Protestant Episcopal
Church in Texas*A. C. Zabriskie
- HUGHES, H. L.: *The Catholic Revival in Italy,
1815-1915*S. William Halperin

Genhale
841
Prof VanderValde
4-23-52
V.S. #2-4

COVERDALE

JAMES MOFFATT

Union Theological Seminary, New York City

History knows men who did not begin till they were in the middle of their days. It is only on approaching or entering the forties that some people seem to strike the line of their real achievement. Up to that period they may have been active and useful, but they have not awakened to their vocation; as yet they are unconscious of their true powers. While this does not apply to the spheres of art and music, it is far from being uncommon in politics and literature. There, as any student of biography soon becomes aware, a man may not find himself till he is about forty. Sometimes it is then or thereabouts—*nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*—that something happens, and a man of action, a thinker, an author, first gets the chance or the idea of doing what turns out to be the most significant thing in his career.

Miles Coverdale is a case in point. He lived till he was eighty, and it was half-way through his long career that he came across the opportunity of doing the one piece of work for which he is remembered. He was born in 1488, about a year earlier than Cranmer and Cromwell, ten years after Sir Thomas More and five years later than Martin Luther. Like Wiclif and Cuthbert Tunstall before him, like Roger Ascham, Robert Ferrar, Adam Loftus, and Tillotson after him, Coverdale came from Yorkshire in the north of England, a county characterized by a spirit of sturdy independence, even of disaffection now and then, in religion as well as in politics. At Cambridge University Miles was no more than an average plodder. As a student he made no mark and showed no promise. Fortunately as a graduate he joined the Austin Friars, one of the religious houses which clustered round a mediaeval university, and during his twelve years of residence in this com-

munity, between 1514 and 1526, his mind gradually awoke, as he was brought into touch with the ferment of Luther's teaching through Robert Barnes, the prior, one of his distinguished contemporaries at the university. Barnes, after what we should describe as a post-graduate course at Louvain, had returned to rule the Austin Friars at Cambridge, where, like so many of the dons, he developed a keen sympathy with Luther's religious genius, which Louvain had tried to represent as irreligious anarchy. It is remarkable that Cambridge at this period of upheaval housed and trained most of the prominent men who were destined to reform the Church of England as well as some leaders of the reactionary opposition. If high-minded men like Stephen Gardiner, Thomas Thirlby, and John Fisher were Cantabs, so was a larger group of scholars who later became archbishops, bishops, learned priests, and martyrs; Coverdale's older and younger contemporaries included such figures as John Bale, Robert Barnes, Cranmer, George Day, Edward Fox, John Frith, the friend of Tyndale, George Joye, John Lambert or Nicholson, Latimer, Parker, Ridley, Thomas Sampson, Thomas Shaxton, and "honest little Bilney." Most of them cared more for studying theology than law, civil or canonical, and the impetus to this revival of vital Christianity was Luther's spirit.

Seven of the group were martyred under Henry the Eighth or Queen Mary. The first to get into trouble was Dr. Barnes, who was summoned before Cardinal Wolsey in 1526 for unsound preaching. After a couple of years in prison, he contrived to escape and made his way to Antwerp. Coverdale thought it prudent to follow his chief's example. Luther's works had been hilariously burned at Cambridge by the authorities in 1521; King Henry's book against Luther had moved a short-sighted pope to hail the English monarch as "Defender of the Faith"; by 1523 Parliament had ominously taken note of Lutheran opinions spreading at Cambridge; besides, copies of Tyndale's New Testament were being suppressed, as far as possible, when the translator smuggled them over from the Continent. That learned politician, Cuthbert Tunstall, now bishop of London, denounced the "many children of iniquity, maintainers of Luther's sect, blinded through extreme wickedness, wandering from the way of truth and catholic faith," who "craftily have translated the new Testament into our English tongue."

By this time Coverdale had left the priory to wander about the country preaching as a secular priest, interested in nothing except this "extreme wickedness" of confronting the church with the Word of God. The divine spark had at last fallen upon his mind. But the signs of the times pointed to the quenching of the spark at present, if he remained in England. So he betook himself to the Continent in 1528. There are very few clear data about where he went or what he did, during the next eleven years, the first and the longest of his retreats. In the Low Countries he may have met Tyndale, then engaged in finishing his version of the Bible. Luckily he did not fall into the clutches of the enemy, as was the misfortune of the Gloucestershire scholar. Miles somehow found sanctuary. Being now forty years of age he passed into obscurity, only to emerge after seven years with a literary masterpiece, a complete translation of the Bible into English.

How he came to undertake this task, we cannot ascertain. In these broken years Coverdale had to hide his tracks as he moved about Holland, Germany, Switzerland, and France, in order to avoid arrest; he also covered the tracks of his mind. But the tracks of his inward life led to a conscious end. It is the shining merit of his career that in this period of middle age he detected a need and a want of his religious world. No doubt, Tyndale had already felt the call to put the Bible into English; Coverdale may have caught an impulse from the pioneering work of his great contemporary. May not a quick-witted friend and patron like Cromwell have also urged him to begin? Perhaps. But what gave him courage to go on with the task on his own account was a fresh religious conviction that the Word of God was over-due in English. If he could no longer preach it to his fellow-countrymen, he reflected, might he not spend his exile in translating it, instead of wearing out his soul in bitter impatience? Coverdale was not called upon to sacrifice his life for the cause, as Tyndale and Rogers had to do. Yet there is something heroic in his consciousness of this duty no less than in the toil which he spent upon it single-handed, without any particular equipment, and unsustained by any thought of personal reward.

England was curiously backward in securing a Bible of its own. Germany had over a dozen versions in the vernacular,

before Luther published his New Testament in 1522; France had a French Bible by 1474, twelve years after the first German Bible; the Dutch got a printed Bible of their own in 1477, though it lacked both the Psalms and the New Testament; even the Italians had a popular translation, published at Venice in 1471. But the English had little of the Bible in their own literature except what they picked up eagerly from the *Golden Legend*, which Caxton had printed in 1483; it contained an almost literal rendering of the Pentateuch and the gospels indeed, but this was mixed up with the wood, hay, and stubble of mediaeval legends about apostles and the saints. Tyndale himself had managed to print only the Pentateuch and the New Testament as yet. Thus, when, by an odd shift in the politics and religion of the period, Cranmer and Cromwell came to need an English Bible for the open propaganda of re-formed Christianity within the nation, it was fortunate that Coverdale's diligence had enabled him overseas to finish the first complete version of God's Word in English. His work was ready, and England was ready, or almost ready, for it, in the year 1535.

Miles Coverdale was not technically a scholar like Tyndale. From Cambridge he had taken no taste for Greek, although the study of Greek was one of the powerful weapons which the new religious movement, inside as well as outside the Roman church, was by this time beginning to accept from the new learning. As a matter of fact, Coverdale was too soon for the revival of Greek at Cambridge. During his residence there, Erasmus was indeed attempting, between 1511 and 1513, to introduce Greek into the university, but the project failed. Erasmus found that he had as little gift for teaching as for preaching. Give him a pen, and he was at home; give him a class or a congregation, and he was out of his element. The Cambridge students either failed to attend the class or failed to pay their fees. Besides, some of the Roman authorities still frowned upon this dangerous line of study, which threatened to depreciate scholastic philosophy and the Vulgate version. When Roger Ascham entered the university in 1530, a renaissance of Greek had dawned upon Cambridge, but by that time Coverdale was far afield. Though he was fond of books, he knew little or nothing about the original languages of the Bible. His work was second-hand. "I have with a clear conscience,"

he explained, "purely and faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters," especially Luther, Tyndale, and the Vulgate. Still, he had one supreme asset as a translator. Some translators appear to know every language except their own. Coverdale may have known next to nothing of Hebrew roots and Greek particles, but in translating at any rate he had a rare sense of English. Not merely had he felt the need of an English Bible for the English but, as he laboured at his papers, he possessed or acquired a remarkable instinct for strong, musical, lucid prose. His achievement was timely and notable. Much work had still to be done upon the text of the English Bible, and Coverdale loyally took part in this labour of love, particularly when he prepared for Cranmer and Cromwell the "Great Bible" of 1539, in which his own version of the psalter proved so acceptable that it passed into the Book of Common Prayer, where it remains as one of the glories of what is a classic at once of devotion and of literature.

Outside this work of translation, he was not distinguished. His other translations of German and Latin works are second-rate, like any original prose that he produced. As a preacher, he always had a vogue, on the Continent as well as at home. Personally he seems to have been a favourite, even with some who, like his friend and host, Sir Thomas More, objected to many of his views. Miles was a cheerful, earnest, conscientious Englishman, with no insular provincialisms. He had a genuine appreciation of foreign culture. Indeed it was his very sympathy with continental Protestantism of the more radical type in Germany and Switzerland which made it difficult for him later on to adjust himself to the settlement of religion under Queen Elizabeth. He had been out of England for so long that he seems to have lost touch with the situation at home. Though never bitterly fond of scruples, as Hooper and some others of his party often were, Coverdale's sincere puritanism, by this time Calvinistic rather than Lutheran, disqualified him for appreciating the motives and the methods of his fellow churchmen as they reorganized the Church of England.

At one point his sincerity led him, as sincerity too often leads the sincere, into blundering and even cruelty. A just historical estimate of Coverdale cannot ignore one item in his record, even though the historian is relieved to find that it

stands alone. While Tyndale, like Jerome and Wiclif, was a translator who was also a choleric saint, Coverdale did not embroider his version with stinging notes and acid comments upon the Latin hierarchy. Yet he was far from being, as some of his modern biographers would like to suggest, a pious low-churchman of the sixteenth century. In 1553 a Spanish doctor of medicine was burned by the Calvinists at Geneva for the crime and sin of heresy. But three years before Servetus perished, a continental surgeon, George van Paris, was put to death in London by the English reformers for similar opinions, and Coverdale served on the judicial commission. The *damnosa haereditas* of persecution as a note of orthodoxy still clung to the Catholic tradition; it is disconcerting, though not unintelligible, to discover that the godly Coverdale like Calvin was implicated in some of its final blots upon the page of sixteenth century Christianity.

But this is to anticipate. No sooner had the "Great Bible" been issued than Coverdale was in rough water again. He returned home, only to be driven abroad once more. The fall of Cromwell in 1539, the burning of his old friend Barnes for heresy, and an attack by Convocation upon the "Great Bible" itself, drove him out of England for a second term of exile, which lasted about eight years. He was a marked man. Now that his patron and protector had collapsed, Coverdale at the age of over fifty had to seek shelter outside England, skulking about the Continent for safety. There were smooth places in this sea, it is true. The University of Tübingen gave him the degree of D.D., and he managed to hold a Lutheran pastorate for some years. What turned out to be a happy move, in more ways than one, was his marriage to a Scots girl, exiled from her own land for sympathy with the re-formed faith. Her sister had married a renowned Scots scholar, once the Dominican prior of Perth, who belonged to the numerous Dominicans in sympathy with the Reformation, and had fled south in 1534. He had been a canon of Salisbury cathedral for some years, before crossing to Denmark in 1542, where he became royal chaplain to the king as well as a professor of theology at Copenhagen. And thereby hangs a tale. For John Macalpine, or Maccabaeus (as he Latinized his name), was the indirect means of plucking Miles out of deadly peril, when the Englishman returned to London in 1548, among the exiles and foreign

divines who were flocking to England at the accession of Edward the Sixth. This was in 1548. Protestant hopes were high. With Cranmer in power, Coverdale at last seemed to have come to his own in his own land.

Responsible work fell to him at once, particularly as a preacher. He was despatched on missions to disaffected quarters like Cornwall; and in 1549 he served as chaplain to the troops of Lord Russell who had been commissioned to put down the western rising in Devon. For these and other services, Coverdale found himself a royal chaplain, and then in 1551 he was consecrated bishop of Exeter. Here Miles and his Elizabeth had more peace than pence, however. For a poor man, in these days, preferment to an episcopal benefice sometimes brought less income than expenses at first, and under his aged predecessor the funds of the diocese seem to have been sadly depleted. Indeed Miles was not out of his financial difficulties at Exeter, when the political sky was suddenly clouded. In 1553 the young king's death led to the accession of Queen Mary, and Coverdale, like Cranmer, Hooper, Robert Ferrar, Ridley, and Latimer, was arrested. It was an ugly situation, but most fortunately he had a friend at court, at the court of a strong Protestant state like Denmark. His brother-in-law, Dr. Maccabaeus, actually induced King Christian the Third to intervene on behalf of Coverdale. Twice the monarch sent diplomatic notes to Queen Mary, which, in view of Denmark's power in politics, she could not ignore. At first she made the excuse that the bishop was in prison for no more than a failure to pay some episcopal dues. In reality he was obnoxious not simply as a married clergyman but as one of those who had been directly responsible for introducing the English Bible. Yet, although the queen would have dearly liked to crush him, she probably felt that she could afford to let this particular victim slip from her fingers, especially as his fellow-prisoners had no foreign protectors to interfere with her policy of revenge. Denmark's diplomatic pressure was courteous but persistent. King Christian, determined to save one Protestant from the flames, finally obliged her majesty to let the ex-bishop go. In 1555 he was deported from the country.

This third period of exile lasted for four years. Miles and his Elizabeth sailed for Copenhagen, where he refused to accept a benefice from King Christian, on the ground that he

did not know the Danish tongue. Once more he took a charge in Germany, but found his congregation of dissenters to be so alive with dissension that he was soon glad to seek peace at Geneva, till at last in 1558 Queen Elizabeth's accession promised to relieve England from the Roman threat. Back came Coverdale in 1559. He had still nine years to live. But this minor hero of the struggle for religious freedom did not greatly enjoy the victory.

It is rather pathetic to watch the evening of his career. A man of seventy is too old to become a bishop, and anyhow Coverdale had by this time developed Genevan scruples about robes and ritual which would have been a serious handicap, had he accepted an English bishopric again. Responsible churchmen could not fit him into the organization, much as they respected him. Coverdale had become a pious impossible person, in their view. Even when he was made rector of a London church, it was only three years before he had to retire, declining to fall in with the not unreasonable policy which Elizabeth and her authorities felt obliged to enforce upon the clergy, in order to secure a richer, more reverent service, and discipline for recalcitrant precisians. The poor old man was not able to sympathize with the dominant forces stirring in this new age into which he had survived. It was not that the veteran stood alone. The puritanical party was strongly entrenched in his old university, where a scholar like Cartwright headed the rising opposition to anything in the shape of orders or vestments that differed from the Genevan pattern. Coverdale was consulted by the leaders, as a man in touch with foreign Protestantism at Frankfort, Zurich, and Geneva; also, there was some affectionate, popular support for him in London upon personal grounds. But the moving spirits on his side were all men of the younger generation. He was in their counsels, and yet isolated. As the situation developed, it bred discomfort for him. Unlike his fellow-exile, Bishop Grindal, he could not see his way to yield even a reluctant conformity. The pity of it! Inside the church, people chanted his version of the psalms; but when he died in 1568, at the ripe age of eighty, he was without a benefice, known only as "Father Coverdale" who was now ending his public life as sixty years earlier he had begun it, by preaching unofficially and almost surreptitiously the very Word of God which he had done so much in middle life to translate for Christian England.

LAUD AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

E. R. ADAIR

McGill University, Montreal, Canada

There are few more enigmatic figures in the history of the Church of England than Archbishop Laud. During his lifetime he was assailed by his opponents with almost every crime that their bitterness could suggest, while his friends spoke of him in terms of somewhat measured praise. Dead, to those who disagreed with him he still seemed the "Pope of Canterbury," only a little less than Antichrist himself, while his followers, hailing him as a martyr to his faith, soon forgot all his qualities but those that seemed to typify the Church of England, by him restored to its proper glories.

While he still languished a prisoner in the Tower, his indefatigable enemy, William Prynne, was promising his readers a "Compleate Relation . . . wherein the criminall part of his life will appeare most foule, and detestable."¹ Within a few years of his death Peter Heylyn, his chaplain and his first biographer, feels it no exaggeration to write "that Plutarch, if he were alive, would be much troubled to find a sufficient Parallel wherewith to match him in all the Leneaments of perfect Virtue."² Clarendon and Thomas Fuller, more judicious in judgment, mete out mingled praise and blame, but to the Whig tradition he must remain anathema; Hallam sees his talents "hardly above mediocrity," admits that he was "not literally destitute of religion," but feels that "it was so subordinate to worldly interest and so blended in his mind with the impure alloy of temporal pride, that he became an intolerant persecutor of the puritan clergy, not from bigotry, . . . but systematic policy."³ But this is mildness itself compared with the distilled venom of Lord Macaulay, already sensitive to coming changes in church if not in state which might threaten the fruits of that glorious Revolution he had so often extolled. For "that ridiculous old

1 W. Prynne, *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud*, 1644, p. 35.

2 P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, Dublin, 1719, Lib. V., p. 59.

3 H. Hallam, *Constitutional History of England*, World Library, p. 322.

bigot," as he called Laud, he could "entertain a more unmitigated contempt than for any other character in our history. The fondness with which a portion of the church regards his memory, can be compared only to that perversity of affection, which sometimes leads a mother to select the monster or the idiot of the family as the object of her especial favour." With an unexpected, but none the less grateful flash of humour, Macaulay concludes that "the severest punishment which the two Houses could have inflicted on him would have been to set him at liberty and send him to Oxford."⁴

Even Gardiner, still strong in the Whig tradition, but sternly schooling himself to the strictest impartiality, reluctantly condemns Laud when he writes: "His thorough belief in the unbounded efficacy of external forms and institutions, combined with his complete ignorance of human nature, would be sufficient to goad to madness any nation which might be subject to his control."⁵ This was written in 1863; twenty-six years later when his laborious studies have advanced to the year of Laud's death, he passes a much kindlier judgment when he says: "his refusal to submit his mind to the dogmatism of Puritanism, and his appeal to the cultivated intelligence for the solution of religious problems, has received an ever-increasing response, even in regions in which his memory is devoted to contemptuous obloquy."⁶

But this is far too tepid praise for Laud's modern biographers. His *Diary* and the *History of the Troubles and Tryal* had been published by Henry Wharton in 1695, his complete works appeared in 1847-1860 in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, and the Oxford Movement had hailed him as its progenitor. Under these influences, a very sympathetic re-examination of his opinions has produced almost a complete reversal of judgment: the Tory and the High-Churchman replace Hallam and Macaulay. W. H. Hutton, whose life of Laud is still the best, though it is animated by very definite Anglo-Catholic leanings, justifies most that Laud did, and sees in "the Church of England as she now stands . . . Laud's truest memorial."⁷ Far beyond such modest praise goes Mr. Duncan-

⁴ Macaulay, "Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History of England," in the *Edinburgh Review* for Sept., 1828.

⁵ S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1642*, Vol. II, p. 126.

⁶ S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, Vol. II, p. 108.

⁷ W. H. Hutton, *William Laud*, (ed. of 1905), p. 229.

Jones⁸ who turns history into semi-mystical eulogy and convinces the reader that the neo-Tories, like the Whigs of old, need to be saved from their historians. As a contrast to all this, Mr. R. P. T. Coffin, the latest of Laud's biographers, feeling that it is always necessary for a popular writer to be a little different from his rivals, depicts him as something perilously like a hard-headed business man.⁹

And so Laud remains enigmatic to the end of the chapter; yet when one reads through the great mass of his letters that survive, it is a little difficult to see wherein the enigma lies: they are consistent, filled with a very real honesty, transparent in their likes and their dislikes. Does the difficulty of interpretation really lie in the character of Laud, or is it not rather to be found in the minds of these warring historians, each of whom builds up the man that his eye wants to see and of whom his prejudices can best approve? Is it not possible that Sir Edward Dering was right after all when he described Laud, whom he knew well, as a man who "was alway one and the same man; begin with him at Oxford and so go on to Canterbury, he is unmov'd, unchanged: he never complied with the times, but kept his owne stand, untill the times came up to him."¹⁰ So it is the times, not Laud, that lack consistency, that present a bewildering cycle of change from which every party may choose the good or the evil as they will. And though to his ultimate disaster Laud was much involved in the politics of his day, to the student of his character it is the fortunes of the changing church rather than those of the state that must be followed; for to Laud the welfare of the church was the touchstone of policy.

It is the fashion at the moment to speak with nothing but praise of the actions of Queen Elizabeth; and yet, to the unprejudiced eye, her policy in matters ecclesiastical had produced a success which was both limited and uncertain. True, she had saved England from Rome, she had beaten back the rising tide of Calvinism, but she had accomplished this, as she had accomplished too many of her apparent victories, only by an inevitable and somewhat arid compromise. The bishops were

⁸ A. S. Duncan-Jones, *Archbishop Laud*, 1927.

⁹ R. P. T. Coffin, *Laud: Storm Centre of Stuart England*, 1930.

¹⁰ Sir E. Dering: *A Collection of Speeches* (1642) p. 3; This is from Dering's preliminary introduction, and was not, I think, said before the House of Commons.

her men and glorified her authority, but too often she impoverished them and other clerics by a grasping alienation of church revenue in the interest of the crown; can it be wondered if everywhere the nobility and gentry followed suit? As late as 1634 over half the benefices of England were worth less than £10 per annum.¹¹ The clergy were outwardly conformable, but as Usher says, the "ecclesiastical test which the Queen had instituted . . . brought with it . . . no guarantee of learning," and to say "that the clergy in 1603 was conformable meant only that it was not actively hostile to the Church to which it belonged."¹² In her anxiety to maintain her middle way, Elizabeth had torn from the Church of England all ceremonial that might be called popish and had not replaced it by the intellectual enthusiasm of the growing Puritanism; emotion and reason were both thrown overboard and religion was becoming more and more a mere statutory obligation. The minimum demanded tended to become the maximum performed; daily service was decaying, celebration of the eucharist became rarer and rarer. Clarendon could look back to his early years and write that "The people took so little care of the churches, and the parsons as little of the chancels, that . . . they rarely provided for their stability and against the very falling of very many of their churches; and suffered them, at least, to be kept so indecently and slovenly that they would not have endured it in the ordinary offices of their own houses."¹³

There is no doubt that this parochial lethargy was wide spread, but even before the years of which Clarendon could write, a change was making itself felt elsewhere. During the last decade of the sixteenth century, under the leadership of Hooker at Oxford and Andrewes at Cambridge, a small group within the church was beginning to stress the inherent unity of Christianity, the desirability of reviving and adopting what the early Fathers had taught, and of abandoning only those errors and abuses that they held had crept into the Roman branch of the Catholic church in more recent times. Not only order, but life and colour were to be restored to the Anglican church, and above all it was to have sound basis of authority

11 *Cal. of S. P. Dom.* Chas. 1. 1634-5. cclxxix. No. 7. Extracts from the Register of the Archbishop of Canterbury. £10 per annum in 1634 would be worth at the most about £30 today.

12 R. G. Usher, *Reconstruction of the English Church*, Vol. I., pp. 206-7.

13 Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ed. by W. D. Macray; Vol. I., p. 126.

for its doctrines and the fear of a cry of popery was not to deter men from reviving all that that authority taught. The stress that was thus laid on the principle of the undivided church was of course not new; at the famous Westminster Disputation in April, 1559, the Protestant reformers had indignantly asserted against the claims of Mary's bishops that "we are of the true Catholic Church and maintain the verity thereof."¹⁴ This had some reality to a few men such as Bishop Jewel who rather pitifully asked in his famous *Apologie*, "Why return we not to the pattern of the old Churches?"¹⁵ But to most, the idea of unity and continuity with the Catholic church merely seemed to sanctify all the usages and observances to which they objected. It was probably the gentle reverence and transparent honesty of Bishop Andrewes that contributed more than anything else to give these new ideas a real foothold within the Church of England. He was a controversialist only by accident; rather did he rely on the imperceptible force of example. Confession must not be insisted on, it was but desirable for people who "have their consciences troubled and disquiete." The observances in his own chapel became a model for Worcester and other cathedral usages, but he had no desire to enforce ceremonial; reverence to the altar seemed to him as natural as reverence to the throne of an earthly king.¹⁶ And to these new ideas James was not unsympathetic; he had had his fill of Calvinism which he said "agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the Devil,"¹⁷ and he was quite ready in his opening speech to parliament on March 22, 1604, to declare, "my Faith is the true ancient catholic and apostolick Faith. . . . So will I ever yield all Reverence to Antiquity in the Points of ecclesiastical Policy."¹⁸

It was with this changing religious background that Laud had been educated and that he had established his position at Oxford and in the church. When he entered St. John's College in 1589, the University was a hotbed of Calvinism. But Laud was almost at once brought into contact with John Buckeridge as his tutor, and it was from him that he imbibed those principles that made him an ardent disciple of Lancelot Andrewes.

¹⁴ Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. of 1839, Vol. viii, p. 690.

¹⁵ D. Macleane, *Lancelot Andrewes*, p. 5.

¹⁶ D. Macleane, *Lancelot Andrewes*, pp. 62-63, 65; W. H. Frere, *The English Church in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, pp. 386-7.

¹⁷ W. H. Hutton, *William Laud*, pp. 175-6.

¹⁸ *Commons' Journals*, Vol. I., p. 144.

For thirty-two years Laud maintained a close connection with the University of Oxford, as undergraduate, as fellow, and finally as president of St. John's College. He is so usually thought of as Bishop of London or as Archbishop of Canterbury that it is forgotten how large a part of his life was spent predominantly in a university atmosphere — a part of his life moreover which included the impressionable years of youth and early middle age, when his mind was most susceptible to conviction or to change. It was there he first spoke against the Calvinistic views of the day when, in the Divinity Lectures he delivered in 1602, he maintained that the visible church of Christ had persisted undimmed and unbroken in the church of Rome; there his opinions first incurred the enmity of Abbot, then Master of University College and later to be his predecessor in the see of Canterbury; there he found preferment to the presidency of his College almost snatched from him by his rivals, only to be granted by the decision of the king. His mind, his character, his whole life was moulded and formed by his long connection with Oxford. Sir Philip Warwick, who had considerable skill in the depicting of his contemporaries, sums up the situation very adroitly when he wrote his memoirs thirty years after Laud's death; "Archbishop Laud was a man of an upright heart and a pious soul, but of too warm blood and too positive a nature towards asserting what he believed a truth to be a good courtier; and his education fitted him as little for it as his nature: which having been most in the university, and among books and scholars, where oft canvassing affairs that are agitated in that province, and prevailing in it, rather gave him wrong than right measures of a court."¹⁹

For St. John's College was to Laud the microcosm where he learnt the display of those talents which he might later extend to the University at large, and to the whole Church of England. There Laud was able to develop his love for seemly order, for proper ritual; within the College his word was all powerful, just as later when he became chancellor, it was all powerful in the University; and so, he felt still later it should be within the church. There he acquired that reverence for forms, that meticulous attention to detail, that determination to stand upon the letter of the law, that made it so difficult for

¹⁹ Sir Philip Warwick, *Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles the First*, ed. of 1813, p. 80.

him to compromise with those who differed from him. There he learnt that acerbity of manner which is still so characteristic of the college don who has been assailed on questions upon which he regards himself as the only sound authority—an acerbity which, equally characteristically, he probably would later consider a little too unfair to his opponents and would, as Sir Edward Dering says, “often (of himselfe), find wayes and meanes to sweeten many of them againe, when they least looked for it.”²⁰ Even the rather stilted and self-conscious humour with which he every now and then lards his letters to Wentworth, the niceness of his diction, the lack of that robust frankness of expression which marked so many of his contemporaries,²¹ show the effects of the long years of his Oxford apprenticeship. No doubt there was an Oxford manner in those days as there is today. The very words in which an anonymous poet glorifies the beautiful new buildings that Laud erected for his College of St. John’s might well be applied, though more metaphorically, to the work he tried to accomplish for the Church of England:

Whose structure well contrived doth not relate
To antic fineness but strong, lasting state,
Beauty well mixed with strength, that it complies
Most with the gazer’s use, much with his eyes.²²

Laud never lost those virtues and those vices that Oxford had embedded so deeply in a mind naturally inclined to authority and tradition; and with his appointment as Bishop of Bath and Wells in 1626, he set out to bring order to the Church of England just as he did into the University of Oxford when as chancellor he sent down new statutes for them to accept. No detail in the church was to be too small for his attention if it conduced to seemliness and uniformity, just as no detail had been too small in his supervision of Oxford life. As late as 1634 he was writing to the Warden of All Souls: “And this charge I require you, Mr. Warden, to deliver to all the Fellows, but especially the officers, that they use not long, undecent hair, nor wear large falling bands, nor boots under their gowns, nor any other like unstatutable novelty in their apparel. For these kinds of excesses, I understand, are much grown into

²⁰ Sir Edward Dering, *A Collection of Speeches*, 1642, p. 3.

²¹ In all his letters, I have found only one sentence that could be described as improper.

²² Quoted in R. P. T. Coffin, *Laud*, p. 138.

that College."²³ From the beginning it was quite clear that this detailed love of order was the end to which he was aiming in church as in university; when on trial for his life he defended his actions in words that might almost be called his confession of faith: "I have never urged nor enjoined any Popish or Superstitious Ceremonies without warrant of Law; But all that I laboured for in this particular was, that the external Worship of God in this Church, might be kept up in Uniformity and Decency, and in some Beauty of Holiness. And this the rather, because first I found that with the Contempt of the Outward Worship of God, the Inward fell away apace, and Profaneness began boldly to show it self."²⁴

Of all the ceremonies that he advocated—making a reverence towards the communion table, bowing the knee at the name of Jesus, kneeling at the altar rails to receive communion, placing of the table altar-wise at the east end—it was the last that has attracted most attention, partly because it was a material matter that could be examined and partly because it really was a symbol of vital importance, a symbol of the ousting of the pulpit and the sermon and the reestablishment of the sacraments as the heart and center of religious observance. In the directions appended to Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559, the holy table was to be "set in the place where the altar stood . . . and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed; at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard . . . and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate."²⁵ This obviously regarded as a normal procedure the temporary moving of the table to some convenient spot within the chancel and, though there might be some doubt as to the validity over the church of these Injunctions, there could be none in regard to the famous Eighty-second Canon of 1604 which allowed the moving of the table during the time of communion not only within the chancel but within the church as well, if it were more convenient to do so.²⁶ In the famous case at Grantham in 1627, Bishop Williams, in whose diocese the town lay and to whom the disputing parties

23 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 388. Laud to Dr. Richard Astley, Warden of All Souls, Aug. 1, 1634.

24 *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of . . . William Laud*, 1695, p. 156.

25 Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, p. 440.

26 E. Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. I, p. 293.

appealed, decided strictly in accordance with the Canons of 1604;²⁷ so also did he in the less well known case at Leicester in 1633.²⁸ It was typical of both Charles I and Laud that this diversity of practice in sometimes moving the table and sometimes not, did not meet with approval, and Williams, in Feb., 1634, was firmly rapped over the knuckles; "though the canon say the people may receive the communion in the chancel or in the body of the church," writes Laud, the king "likes it not that the ordinary (to whose discretion the disjunctive is left) should suffer it to be in the body of the church."²⁹ That the question was normally at the discretion of the ordinary was very dubious and Charles was taking no risks. In the even more famous case of St. Gregory's by St. Paul's in London, where five parishioners appealed against the fixing of the table altar-wise at the east end of the church, the king called the matter before the Privy Council and on Nov. 3, 1633, pronounced judgment himself, that this "liberty is not so to be understood, as if it were ever left to the discretion of the parish, much less to the particular fancy of any humorous person, but to the judgment of the ordinary."³⁰ That Laud was wholly in agreement with this, in fact probably inspired it, is seen in the directions given to his vicar-general for the great visitation of 1634 by which he is "to command the said churchwardens to place the Communion-Table under the Eastern Wall of the Chancel, where formerly the Altar stood, to set a decent rail before it to avoid profaneness; and at the Rail the Communicants to receive the blessed Sacrament."³¹ And the Canons of 1640, though they strive moderately to explain the need for, and the justification of, this rule, for its unpopularity was only too obvious, make no change, the only discretion being still that of the bishop.³²

Of course it would be unfair to suggest that there were not a considerable number of people in England who thoroughly approved of these so-called innovations and other ceremonies of the same kind. Prebendary Smart of Durham reports that a young man had said, "I had rather go forty miles

²⁷ S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, 1603-1642, Vol. VII, pp. 16-18.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 309.

²⁹ Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 350. Laud to Williams, Feb. 25, 1634. The ordinary was usually the bishop of the diocese.

³⁰ S. R. Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, pp. 103-5.

³¹ P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, ed. of 1719, Lib. IV, p. 25.

³² Laud's *Works*, Vol. V, pp. 624-5.

to a good service than two miles to a sermon." "And what meant he by a good service?" comments the Puritan Smart. "His meaning was manifest: where goodly Babylonish garments were worn, embroidered with images, where he might have a delicate noise of singers, with shakebuts and cornets and organs, and, if it were possible, all kinds of music, used at the dedication of Nabuchodonosor's golden image." "A strange speech," he concludes, "little better than blasphemy."³³

But a great many did not think like this rash young man, and they felt that they had been tricked by the king and Laud. They had been offered by the Canon a decent liberty and then had been told that it was not really liberty at all, for the discretion of the bishop was a mere farce and Laud knew it. There were few bishops like Williams of Lincoln since, as the years went by, more and more were being appointed by the king on Laud's advice and consequently it was perfectly safe to leave matters to their discretion, because only those who agreed with Laud had ever a chance of being appointed. The letter of the law might be observed, but Laud's claim that "the Church does not require assent unto particulars"³⁴ was mere playing upon words, for observance of this and other ceremonial ritual became with increasing frequency the tests that were applied in order to determine a man's orthodoxy. Laud might declare that, except in regard to fundamentals, he would not maintain opinions which might "shut any Christian, even the meanest, out of heaven,"³⁵ but he was not above making things very uncomfortable for them on earth. And even accepting Laud's dictum at its face value, there was always a weighting of the scales in favour of the views he upheld, because he was the real authority that decided what was or was not fundamental. Can it be wondered that the Puritans felt that the church was accuser, judge and jury in its own cause, that Laud was indeed the pope of Canterbury?

It might be unfair to suggest that Laud had within him a good deal of the spirit of the Counter Reformation though it is an arguable point, but he certainly had still less that of the Reformation itself in so far as it stressed individual judgment

³³ W. H. Hutton, *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne*, 1913, pp. 101-2.

³⁴ Quoted from the "Controversy with Fisher" in W. H. Hutton: *William Laud*, p. 58.

³⁵ Quoted from the "Controversy with Fisher," in W. H. Hutton, *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne*, pp. 42-3.

and individual revelation; though even here his scrupulous attention to the letter of the law gives him an appearance of toleration. In the matter of bowing upon going into or out of church, no clear instructions were given, and in the Canons of 1640 Laud "heartily commends it to all good people," but "in the practice or omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite, despise not them who use it not, and that they who use it not, condemn not those that use it."³⁶ Unkind cynics might suggest that this gentleness is a mere sop thrown to opponents who, by 1640, were becoming really dangerous. For it must be remembered that to Laud and to his opponents alike, the seemly ordering of ritual was of vital importance; this he shows quite clearly in what he says in his speech at the censure on Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick in 1637: "For my care of this Church, the reducing of it into order, the upholding of the external worship of God in it, and the settling of it to the rules of its first reformation, are the causes (and the sole causes, what ever are pretended) of all this malicious storm which hath lowered so black upon me and some of my brethren."³⁷ Today these squabbles over ceremonial may seem rather petty, but they are symbols of the real points at issue between Laud and the Puritans. Shall the authority of the church apostolic be added to that of the Scriptures, shall the episcopal authority which maintained these ceremonies be defended, would its downfall not imply the fall of the royal authority as well, is not the ceremonial church essentially a royalist church, or is not all this ritual a mere approach to popery? In so far as the last fear is concerned, there can be no hesitation about the answer. Laud never showed the least desire to return to the Roman fold, he always maintained vigorously that the church did not cease to be national by becoming catholic. On two occasions during the year 1633 he records that it was suggested to him that he might receive a cardinal's hat, but as he says "somewhat dwelt within me that would not suffer that, till Rome were other than it is."³⁸

But might it not be asked whether Laud, like the later Newman, would not ultimately have been forced intellectually into the Catholic fold, whether it was not his death, rather

³⁶ Laud's *Works*, Vol. V, p. 626.

³⁷ Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 42.

³⁸ *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of . . . William Laud*, 1695, p. 49.

than his theology, that prevented his conversion? This question really results from a misunderstanding of Laud's position in all its various facets, political, ecclesiastical and intellectual. He was Archbishop of Canterbury and the trusted adviser of the king, a position which not even that of a cardinal could rival. To be a mere subordinate to the pope would have no attraction for Laud, still less so when it is remembered that conversion would have meant exile and execration. In the nineteenth century converts were despised, in the seventeenth century they were traitors to both church and king. Moreover, Newman had constantly to justify and explain his position and inevitably came to look with longing at the intellectual security offered by the Roman Catholic church, if one had faith enough to accept its premises—a security so different from the dubious instability of Anglo-Catholicism. But not so with Laud; for him the Anglican church was the true church, the Roman branch the one that had unfortunately fallen into error. He was not forced to defend his views against equals in the church, he was in a position to enforce them upon inferiors, consequently he was never intellectually shaken, never driven to wonder if after all he did not need authority behind him. He was the authority, he was the ecclesiastical head of the one stream of Catholic Christianity that was still pure and undefiled.

If he would not become a papist, can he be called an Arminian? He often was, by his enemies, but the term was used as little more than one of abuse, merely to signify something of which the speaker disapproved. Moreover, exactly what would constitute an Arminian in England was, and still is, vague. When George Morley, who later became Bishop of Winchester, was asked what the Arminians held, he is said to have replied, "All the best livings in England"³⁹—a witty evasion of the difficulties of definition. Laud had enough sympathy with Arminianism to desire Bishop Hall to omit from his *Reconciler* those passages which declared the anti-Arminian character of the Church of England,⁴⁰ but this implies no more than that Laud and the Arminians had some views in common. Of Laud's complete loyalty to the Church of England there is no real doubt.

A good deal of stress has been laid upon the question of

³⁹ E. W. Kirby, *William Prynne*, 1931, p. 10.

⁴⁰ *Cal. of S. P. Dom.*, 1628-9, Chas. I., CXXXVI, 81. Feb. (?), 1629. Bishop Hall to Turner, Licenser and Chaplain to Laud.

ceremonies because to Laud they became the vital tests of uniformity and, notwithstanding all his liberal protestations, to attain uniformity he was profoundly determined. As Gardiner says, "Uniformity to him was the surest propagator of unity of spirit."⁴¹ On the one hand this led him to overemphasize external observance as the only test of true religion, on the other it persuaded him to cast his eyes abroad for fresh fields to conquer. He was fond of saying that the Church of England, unlike that of Rome, legislated only for her own children; but not only did he fail to allow those children to grow up and leave home if they wanted to do so, but he was anxious to bring all their cousins into the family as well. On the basis of the doctrine of personal religion, he interfered to see that Englishmen who lived abroad as members of the Company of Merchant Adventurers followed his views as to what constituted orthodoxy; at home on the basis of a territorial religion he took measures to make the French and Dutch congregations in England conform, quoting from Exodus that "One law (and especially for Divine Worship) shall be to him that is home-born, and to the Stranger that Sojourns among you."⁴²

In the Irish church he had also much his own way, though he wrote to Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh, that what was wanted was "not conformity to or with the Church of England, but with the whole Catholic Church of Christ."⁴³ Almost all Irish church business was referred to Laud, only points that he could not solve being submitted to the Irish Committee of the Council.⁴⁴ With Wentworth's support, most of the English Articles were adopted in Ireland, though Laud was bitter that the Canon calling for reverence at the name of Jesus was omitted. "Since they will have no joint in their knees to honour Him, they may get the gout in the knees not to serve themselves."⁴⁵ But improvement according to the principles of the English church was so manifest that by 1637 Wentworth could write: "And therefore God forbid Laud should take off his hand of Care and Direction for us," for this would mean to "cast behind us all outward respect or Service to Man and God."⁴⁶

41 S. R. Gardiner, "William Laud" in the *D. N. B.*

42 *History of the Troubles and Tryal of . . . William Laud*, 1695, p. 165.

43 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VII, p. 292-3. Laud to James Ussher, Nov. 5, 1636.

44 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 66, 75. Laud to Wentworth, Apr. 12, June 23, 1634.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 132. Laud to Wentworth, May 12, 1635.

46 Burghclere, *Strafford*, Vol. II, p. 71. Wentworth to Laud, Oct. 18, 1637.

Laud's relations with the church in Scotland are better known and more immediately disastrous. That Laud was the driving force behind the changes introduced into the Scottish church there is no doubt, though he himself greatly minimizes the part that he played; equally certain, of course, is it that King Charles was entirely sympathetic with what was being done. But popular opinion of the day accused Laud of the chief responsibility. The Venetian ambassador is constantly reporting, "The Archbishop of Canterbury, on whose advice alone his Majesty decides in these matters pertinaciously upholds his regulations and will not listen to anything different"; "the Archbishop is much piqued . . . he says he will risk everything rather than yield a jot," and so on.⁴⁷ And Laud's letters, on the whole, justify popular opinion; to Wentworth he writes: "You cannot have a greater desire to conform Ireland to the Church of England than I (and this with as seeming great a desire of the King) to conform Scotland to the Church of England."⁴⁸ To attain this end, the Scotch bishops were dragooned, wherever possible, by refusal of favour or promotion, if they did not adopt the new ideas. When the Bishop of Dunblane did not conduct the services in the Chapel Royal as the king and the archbishop liked, Laud wrote quite frankly to him: "his Majesty is not well pleased . . . and this hath been the cause, as I conceive, why his Majesty hath passed you over in this remove; and you shall do very well to apply yourself better, both to his Majesty's service and the well ordering of that Church lest you give just occasion to the King to pass you by, when any other remove falls."⁴⁹ Dunblane had wanted the bishopric of Edinburgh; and the following year he received that of Aberdeen as a reward, quite openly admitted, for his conformity.⁵⁰ Moreover, when Laud thought the ground had been sufficiently prepared, there is no question of the part he played both in inspiring and in supervising the drawing up of the new liturgy; his letter to the Bishop of Dunblane enclosing corrections and suggestions makes that quite clear.⁵¹

Laud failed more suddenly and spectacularly in Scotland than he did in England possibly because, as Argyle writes in

47 *Cal. of S. P., Ven.*, 1636-9, pp. 273, 316, nos. 300, 336. Anzolo Correr to Doge and Senate, Sept. 25, Nov. 6, 1637.

48 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 489. Laud to Wentworth, Oct. 8, 1638.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 371. Laud to Bishop of Dunblane, May 6, 1634.

50 *Ibid.*, p. 419. Laud to Bishop of Dunblane, May 19, 1635.

51 *Ibid.*, pp. 455-459. April 20, 1636.

1639, "they are the loather to come under the hands of indiscreet pedants or rude taskmasters that want the affection and moderation of a father."⁵² Or more possibly still because the average Scotchman, unlike the average Englishman, has long regarded argument and dialectic both as a spiritual exercise and a pleasing recreation.

The king acted, though Laud inspired, or Laud acted, though on the commands of the king. Can Laud then be called an Erastian? This is not at all an easy question to answer. Laud quite definitely was prepared to fulfil all that the letter of the law demanded, though he bitterly resented any interference by parliament in church matters and regarded the claims of the common law courts over the church and church courts as something to be fought tooth and nail. "As for the Church," he writes to Wentworth in 1633, "it is so bound up in the Forms of the Common Law, that it is not possible for me, or for any Man to do that good which he would, or is bound to do."⁵³ "The lawyers," writes Dr. Lancy, in regard to the High Commission, "have pared our ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the quick . . . if it goes on thus, the commissioners may shut up shop."⁵⁴ Laud did not question the lay authority, but he resented its encroachments. "Nor did I ever deny, that the exercise of my jurisdiction was derived from the Crown of England," said he at his trial. "But . . . my order as a Bishop, and my power of jurisdiction, is by Divine Apostolical right, and unalterable (for aught I know) in the Church of Christ."⁵⁵ Laud undoubtedly felt that the church and state were really indissolubly united and knit together, and, as he wrote in 1626, "This nearness makes the Church call in the help of the State, to succour and support her, whensoever she is pressed beyond her strength: And the same nearness makes the State call in for the service of the Church, both to teach that duty which her members know not, and to exhort them to, and encourage them in that duty which they know."⁵⁶

And Laud carried out his share of the bargain, for though he asserted that he was "never yet such a fool, as to embrace

⁵² *Hist. MSS. Com., Report XII*, App. Pt. 2, Coke MSS., pp. 213-215. Argyle to Laud, Feb. 28, 1639. The spelling has been modernised.

⁵³ Knowles, *Strafford Letters*, Vol. I, p. 111. Laud to Wentworth, Sept. 9, 1633.

⁵⁴ Birch, *Court and Times of Charles I*, Vol. II, p. 21. Dr. Lancy to Cosin, June 25, 1629.

⁵⁵ Laud's *Works*, Vol. III, p. 406.

⁵⁶ P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, ed. of 1719, Lib. III, p. 103.

arbitrary government,"⁵⁷ the church under his direction opened wide the gates to the king's arbitrary will, if he desired to exercise it, in church and state alike. In 1627, over Abbot's objections, he brought about the licensing of Dr. Robert Sibthorpe's sermon in which subjects were told that in all cases they were bound "to yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one."⁵⁸ As at the beginning of his period of power, so at the end, for the Canons of 1640 say plainly that those who resist the king "shall receive to themselves damnation."⁵⁹

The king was the support of the sort of church Laud liked best; under the law the king had great power over the church, its property and its convocations. To Laud that was good, because he found the fruits of that power in complete agreement with his views. He was even prepared to extend that royal authority, because then, in debatable cases, he could use it to enforce his orders. There was no question of a divided loyalty, and therefore no very careful definition on the part of Laud and his sympathisers of the line between the authority of the church and that of the king. It would be much easier to discuss the question of Laud's Erastianism, if Charles had espoused the cause of Presbyterianism and left Laud shivering in the ranks of the opposition to the crown; then he would have been forced to decide where his allegiance lay.

And so what was Laud? Do the various parts of his life and character fall into place like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle to give us a completed picture of the whole? President of an Oxford College or Archbishop of Canterbury; persecutor or broad minded father of his erring children; devil or saint; mystic seeing in ritual but the inward and spiritual light or practical man using ceremonies to gauge uniformity; Papist, Arminian, Erastian or Anglican? All these are possible, but not in the same man; yet on some aspects of his character there can be agreement. Clarendon expresses them very fairly and concisely: "He was a man of great courage and resolution, and being most assured within himself that he proposed no end in all his actions or designs than what was pious and just, . . . he never studied the best ways to those ends: . . . let the cause be

⁵⁷ W. H. Hutton, *William Laud*, p. 127.

⁵⁸ W. H. Hutton, *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne*, 1913, p. 27.

⁵⁹ Laud's *Works*, Vol. V, p. 614.

what it will he did court persons too little; nor cared to make his designs and purposes appear as candid as they were by showing them in any other dress than their own natural beauty and roughness; and did not consider enough what men said or were like to say of him."⁶⁰ And Fuller adds the final touch to complete this view of the picture when he says that Laud was apt "to infuse more vinegar then oyle into all his censures."⁶¹ He had more than a touch of that self-satisfaction and self-confidence which possibly even then Oxford was breeding. On the one hand this saved him from the sycophancy of the courtier and maintained his integrity; no one ever found him guilty of being influenced by bribes, and he bitterly attacked corruption in persons like Weston or Cottington. On the other hand, it made him unwilling to seek counsel, "seldom advising with any of the other Bishops," as Heylyn says, "till he had digested the whole business, and then referring nothing to them but the Execution";⁶² and his letters reveal reproofs decidedly offensive in their wording administered even to such friends as Wentworth and Sir Thomas Roe. For he was seldom able to appreciate how his actions would appeal to other people—they seemed so right to himself; he was tactless, he would moderate little; it is rare that one finds him writing as he did to Wentworth in November 1635: "And yet, my Lord, if you could find a way to do all these great Services and decline these Storms, I think it would be excellent well thought on."⁶³

That he might maintain this sense of the justice of his cause, his honesty made him scrupulously fair—but usually no more than fair—to his enemies. Probably he disliked and feared no man more than Williams, Bishop of Lincoln. Williams was out of favour, and Laud was determined that he should not come back. When Williams sought reconciliation with Buckingham, Laud dreamed a nightmare of pursuit in which Williams leaped on horseback and could never be caught.⁶⁴ In a later dream conscience whispered in his ear "that I was the Cause, why the Bishop of Lincoln was not again admitted into Favour, and to Court."⁶⁵ When Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury, it

60 Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ed. by W. D. Macray, Vol. I, pp. 124-5.

61 T. Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain*, 1648, Bk. XI, p. 217.

62 P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, ed. of 1719, Lib. V, p. 57.

63 Knowler, *Strafford Letters*, Vol. I, p. 479. Laud to Wentworth, Nov. 16, 1635.

64 *History of the Troubles and Tryal of . . . William Laud*, 1695, pp. 37, 38. Jan. 13, 14, 1627.

65 *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

was through him that Williams sought to approach the king; Laud did his duty, but no more: "Therefore, if your Lordship . . . shall think I have not performed towards you all I undertook, you wrong me; but if you think I shall forsake any just cause of the King's to assist you, you deceive yourself; for it is one thing to sue for favour, and another to do justice."⁶⁶ Yet Laud was a kindly man: when in 1634 Prynne was before the Star Chamber, and Attorney General Noy suggested that he be kept close prisoner, with neither pen, ink, paper, nor liberty to go to church, Laud protested. "I confess I do not know what it is to be close Prisoner, and to want Books, Pen, Ink and Company. . . . And as Mr. Attorney saith, he (Prynne) is past all Grace and Modesty; surely then he had need to be more free, and have Books and go to Church, that he may become better."⁶⁷ To take away pen and paper from Prynne would have made imprisonment a mere living death.

And Laud had some humour, though of a rather self-conscious type. Heylyn writes of his "cheerfulness and vivacity," how "of Apprehension he was quick and sudden, of a very sociable Wit, and a pleasant Humour."⁶⁸ And on one occasion he refuses, though he had become an Archbishop, to write long letters to Wentworth "and leave out my mirth."⁶⁹ He announces to Windebank his appointment as secretary of state with a pleasing quip: "So you now have a . . . cure to attend to . . . the name of the parish is S. Troubles."⁷⁰ When he writes of the Earl of Cork's tomb in St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, he is surprised "that so massy a tomb should stand upon Cork."⁷¹ When he is having the records in the Tower searched for some church documents he wonders "what the State means, to commit so many rats to the Tower, and provide no meat for them but records. And it seems hunger made them valiant as mastiffs, else I wonder how they durst venture upon a Bull."⁷² As an Oxford man he proudly parades his learning before Wentworth who had been to Cambridge.⁷³ But this humour is rare and has that somewhat dessicated quality peculiar to the university

66 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 408. Laud to Williams, Jan. 10, 1635.

67 Rushworth, *Collections*, Vol. II, p. 248.

68 P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, ed., 1719, p. 58.

69 Knowler, *Strafford Letters*, Vol. I, p. 111. Laud to Wentworth, Sept. 9, 1633.

70 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 43-44. Laud to Windebank, June 13, 1632.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 174. Laud to Wentworth, Oct. 4, 1635.

72 Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, p. 80. Laud to Wentworth, June 23, 1634.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 53. Laud to Wentworth, Dec. 2, 1633.

lecturer. It needs the bitterness of his trial to produce that pungency of wit which he flung at Lord Saye and Sele: "What a happiness hath this lord, that his pale meagerness cannot blush at such a speech as this."⁷⁴

Laud's sermons are dull—they are too much a tabulation of arguments, and Laud was merely a good scholar rather than a great one; there is no depth of emotion, no fiery eloquence. It is indeed one of the ironies of history that Laud should be almost the patron saint of the Oxford Movement and of its fruit, the High Church, which stresses so much the ascetic, the devotional, the unworldly side of religion, whose mystery became symbolic, and whose symbolism became mystical, and yet that he should have so little of the ecstasy of devotion within himself, should be so much a competent housekeeper putting in order the temple of the Lord. And if the ironic note be maintained, one can see with some amusement that while the High Church leans so heavily upon feminine support, Laud exercised no influence over the hearts of women of his own day. As Gardiner says, "No leader of any great Church party before or since was ever so entirely without female admirers. The imagination was left untouched, and the devotional feeling was scarcely roused by the cry of obedience to the letter of the rubrics, which was the Beauty of Holiness to Laud."⁷⁵

And so we come to our completed picture: Laud indefatigable, labouring for the cause he thought right, so cumbered and so weary that he could hardly even write letters to his friends;⁷⁶ and those friends, very few, because he was a man who had always stood much alone; with little real sympathy for others than members of his own class and church—for the common people he did practically nothing; tolerant, but only in matters that seemed to him unimportant; a man who had played a large part in political affairs, but had no great skill in them. The Oxford scholar of modest attainments struggling against a sea of enemies, even more narrow-minded than himself, and striving to create an ordered world of pious observance, based on tradition and sound scholarship, similar to that of the university which he had served so carefully; jealous of the dignity of his order, maintaining the divine right of episcopacy as vigor-

⁷⁴ Quoted by Sir J. F. Stephen in *Horae Sabbaticae*, First Series, 1892, p. 172.

⁷⁵ S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1642*, Vol. VII, p. 340.

⁷⁶ Laud's *Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 71, 416. Laud to Wentworth, Apr. 12, 1634; March 27, 1638.

ously as he did that of kings and creating, possibly as much by his death as by his life, an aspect of the Church of England which provided an emotional outlet for those who desired colour and ceremonial, ardent faith, and a profound belief in the everlasting unity of the Catholic church.

SERVETUS AND THE GENEVAN LIBERTINES

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale University

The defenders of John Calvin have sought to excuse his share in the execution of Servetus by resorting to the type of apologetic employed by Catholics in defense of the Inquisition. The victims, we are told, were politically and socially subversive and would have been suppressed in any age. In the case of Servetus this charge cannot be substantiated from his writings, since he did not reject the oath, nor the authority of the magistrate, neither did he counsel immorality. The only recourse for the apologists is to connect Servetus with Calvin's political opponents, the so-called Libertines. The argument has assumed slightly different forms in different hands, but three main contentions emerge: 1) that Servetus plotted with the Libertines for the overthrow of Calvin's régime; 2) that the Libertines endeavored to bring about the acquittal of Servetus; and 3) that they communicated with him to that end during the course of his trial.

The first contention that Servetus was in league with the Libertines for the overthrow of the Genevan theocracy took the initial form that he had been in Geneva for a month or more prior to his arrest, engaged in machinations with the opposition.¹ This legend would scarcely be worthy of a refutation were it not for the statements of Holl² and Doumergue³ that the conjecture of a residence in Geneva prior to the arrest cannot be refuted once and for all. The only evidence to which they can appeal is the statement made by the Genevan council to the Swiss cities, after a number of the Libertines had been executed and Perrin and Vandiel had saved themselves by flight to the cities of the confederacy. Lest the refugees be given an asylum, the Genevan authorities sought to discredit them on the ground

¹ *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 590 note.

² Karl Holl, *Johannes Calvin*, Tübingen, 1909, p. 53.

³ Emile Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, 7 vols., Neuilly-sur-Seine, 1899-1927, VI, 309, note 5.

that they had given "protection and favor" to Servetus.⁴ We have this document only in a German translation. The word which I have rendered "protection" (*vffenthalt*) commonly means lodging, but is used elsewhere in this letter in the sense of protection.⁵ We do not need to assume, therefore, that Perrin and Vandel entertained Servetus in their homes.

On the other side we have the express statements of Servetus, which went unrefuted in the court room, that he had lodged the night before at Louyset and had arrived alone on foot, planning not to stop, but to go to Naples and practice medicine. With this intent he had lodged at the inn of the Rose, and had already requested the host and hostess to engage a boat that he might go further up the lake and take the road for Zürich. He had hidden himself as much as he could that he might be able to go on without being recognized.⁶

If the testimony of Servetus must be thrown out of court, there are the statements of Beza that he was recognized "very soon,"⁷ in fact "immediately."⁸ Colladon declared that Servetus "was taken in this city where he thought to pass unrecognized."⁹ Calvin wrote, "Perhaps he meant to pass through. We do not yet know with what intent he came."¹⁰ The doubt was not as to what he had done, but as to what he meant to do. Calvin left no room for Servetus' residence in Geneva when he reported to Sulzer that Servetus, after the escape from Vienne, had been wandering in Italy almost four months.¹¹ The mention of Italy

4 *Calvini Opera*, XX, 438.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 437 and note.

6 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 770, §28 "respond quil nestoit venu pour passer de la les montz et non point pour demorer icy, et sen aller au royaulme de naples la ou sont des Espagnolz, et vivre avec eulx de son art de medicine. Et que expressement pour ce fair il sestoit venu loger a la Rose, et quil en avoit ia parle a lhoste et a lhostesse pour trouver une barque pour aller tant hault par le lac quil pourroit pour trouver le chemin de Zurich. Et quil se tenoit cache en ceste ville tant quil pouvoit, affin sen pouvoir aller sans estre cogneu."

Ibid., p. 749. "ledit Servetus . . . a respondu quil . . . se saulva et prit le chemin pour aller contre Espagne dempuys il sen est revenu a cause des gendarmes quil craignoit et sen vouloit passer par icy et par allemagne pour aller de la les mons pour exercer la medicine."

Ibid., p. 782 §38. "respond quil avoit couche le iour devant a leluyset (?) et arriva a pied tout seul, et quil loua encor an cheval a Salenove. Et quil sen vult bien tenir a la dicte de lhoste."

7 "Mox," *Calvini Opera*, XXI, 146.

8 "Statim," *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 602.

9 "esté prins en ceste ville où il pensoit passer comme homme incognu." Cited by Ferdinand Buisson, *Sébastien Castellion*, Paris, 1892, II, 20, note 1.

10 "Hac transire forte cogitabat. Necdum enim scitur quo consilio venerit." *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 589.

11 "Unde nescio quomodo elapsus, per Italiam erravit fere quatuor menses." *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 614.

is a mistaken inference¹² from the news that the heresy of Servetus was flourishing beyond the Alps,¹³ but the reference to the four months is significant. From the escape at Vienne to the arrest at Geneva four months and six days had elapsed (April 7 to August 13). If one allows in Calvin's calculation for a journey to and from Italy in addition to nearly four months in the land, scarcely half a day would remain for a previous residence at Geneva.

But M. Doumergue can relinquish this piece of stage setting without endangering the plot.¹⁴ Wholly apart from any residence in Geneva, he finds indications of collusion with the Libertines. Servetus had asked for an invitation to come to Geneva, and had not received it. The city was not *en route* to Italy. Why, then, did he come, if not because he counted on the Libertines? Unquestionably there is a problem here. The solution may be simply that a detour was necessary for a hunted man. But if not, inability to find an entirely satisfactory answer must not drive us to accepting a solution unwarranted by the evidence.

The apologists for Calvin point next to the fact that Servetus endeavored to conceal his relations with Guillaume Gueroult, the printer of the *Restitutio*, himself a Libertine. Early in the trial Servetus was accused by Gueroult of avoiding him. Servetus answered promptly that he had done nothing of the sort.¹⁵ But on the next day he admitted that he had concealed the copy of the book from Gueroult.¹⁶ Successive evasions culminated in the assertion that he did not even know the man's last name. He had never heard him called anything but "Maistre Guillaume."¹⁷ Why all this concealment, if there was not something sinister about the connection?¹⁸ The answer is simply that Gueroult had come to Geneva and was himself on trial for having played the Roman Catholic at Vienne.¹⁹ Servetus, whether aware of this fact or not, wished to exonerate him from any responsibility for the printing of the *Restitutio*.

¹² *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 782 §37.

¹³ *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 577.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, VI, 310.

¹⁵ *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 731, 734 §38.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 740, §38.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 768, §11, 780, §15, 781, §22-25.

¹⁸ Albert Rilliet, *Relation du procès criminel intenté à Genève, en 1553, contre Michel Servet*, Geneva, 1844, p. 65. Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

¹⁹ Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, VI, 310. Gueroult was not released until Sept. 5. The last of these statements of Servetus was made on Aug. 28.

In precisely the same fashion Servetus refused to supply information which might incriminate any one at Vienne.²⁰

A further indication of a conspiracy with the Genevan opposition is found in a supposed change of tone on the part of Servetus. We are told that he recanted at Basel, retracted at Paris, and evaded at Vienne. Why was he so bold at Geneva, if not that he felt sure of support?²¹ Calvin said that he might have been saved had he shown "the least sign of modesty . . . wherefore the conjecture is probable that he had some vain confidence, from I do not know where, which ruined and lost him."²² Where Calvin was in doubt, M. Doumergue does not hesitate to call in the Libertines. But this whole picture is inaccurate. Servetus had by no means been so docile on previous occasions. M. Doumergue himself finds the recantation at Basel characterized by the same "determined vehemence."²³ As for the attitude at Geneva, Calvin had strange notions of what constituted the "least sign of modesty."

If there was any change in the outlook of Servetus, it lay in the region of eschatology. The archangel Michael and his hosts should slay the dragon, though some of his followers should fall. "I know that I shall die on this account, but I do not falter, that I may be a disciple like the Master . . . He will come. He will certainly come. He will not tarry."²⁴ Servetus did expect an intervention, although not from the Libertines but from the Lord.

A further consideration adduced to show that Servetus counted on the cooperation of the Libertines is the fact that he arrived at precisely the moment when Calvin was in the most critical situation. The struggle over the spiritual independence of the church was just coming to a head. Calvin asserted with all the conviction of a Hildebrand that the church alone should control excommunication. The church alone must prevent the Lord's table from profanation. This is a spiritual matter in which the magistrate has no right to interfere. Philip Berthelier, one of the leaders of the Libertines, had been excommunicated, but the council proposed to restore him. Calvin appeared before an extraordinary session on Saturday, September 2, 1553 and

20 *Calvini Opera* VIII, 792.

21 Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, VI, 318-319 and 322.

22 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 480. M. Doumergue cites from the French version.

23 "violence convaincue." *Op. cit.*, VI, 205.

24 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 751.

asserted that he would die a hundred times rather than subject Christ to such shameful derision.²⁵ The council weakened and secretly advised Berthelier not to appear at the communion on the morrow, but Calvin did not know this and defiantly proclaimed in his sermon, "If any one comes to this table, who has been excluded by the Consistory, I will do my duty with my life."²⁶ Calvin came down slowly from the pulpit and placed himself behind the communion table. "There must have been in that vast cathedral a great silence followed by a singular astonishment. Behind the table stands this man, pale, thin, broken, worn, who seems nothing but a breath, but whose eye, burning with a blind fever, looks over the audience to find the excommunicated man. The crowd, moved, subdued as only a crowd can be, looks too. Nobody! Nothing! Berthelier does not present himself. Berthelier is not there!"²⁷ Calvin had won.

But this victory could not have been foreseen three weeks before, when Servetus arrived. At that time the situation was highly critical. Servetus, we are told, knew and counted on the fact. The only evidence is a letter from Musculus of Berne to Bullinger, saying that "Servetus had recently come to Geneva to take advantage of the rancor with which the government pursued Calvin. He hoped to obtain a foothold from which he would be able to carry on the affair with the other churches."²⁸ This statement, emanating from Berne, was as much a guess as the supposition of Bullinger that "the providence of God brought Servetus to Geneva that she might have an opportunity to purge herself of the charge of heresy and blasphemy by punishing him as he deserved."²⁹ There is, then, no proof that Servetus was in collusion with the Libertines. The accusation of sedition is without foundation.

The charge may nevertheless have been made, and Rilliet would contend that it was in fact the dominant concern of the prosecution. Politics will have played a much larger rôle than theology.³⁰ This interpretation rests on the fact that after

²⁵ *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 606.

²⁶ Cited by M. Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, VI, 334, from Gautier who had access to a source now lost.

²⁷ Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, VI, 332-34.

²⁸ *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 628.

²⁹ *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 624.

³⁰ Albert Rilliet, *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

Servetus had been examined as to his theology on the basis of Calvin's charges, the public prosecutor then entered and, putting theology largely aside, tried to prove that Servetus from the outset had been a turbulent character. This is all true, but the prosecutor soon made his exit, while Calvin reentered, accompanied by theology, which alone affected the ultimate decision. The sentence was based on two counts only: anti-Trinitarianism and anti-paedobaptism.³¹ The trial wore a political aspect only in the broader sense that heresy was always regarded as socially subversive.

The second contention of the apologists is that the Libertines attempted to secure the acquittal of Servetus. The evidence is not unimpeachable. Calvin had *heard* that Berthelier had intervened at the examination in favor of Servetus.³² Bullinger had *heard* that the Libertines supported Servetus out of hatred for Calvin.³³ Roset said that Berthelier had been *accused* of favoring Servetus.³⁴ Calvin declared that Perrin "feigned sickness for three days"—how could Calvin know that he was not really sick?—"but at length went to the council in order to deliver the scoundrel and was not ashamed to petition that the case be carried to the Two Hundred."³⁵ Of all this the official records know absolutely nothing. The anonymous *Historia* said that Perrin absented himself from the final sitting.³⁶ He did not. The record shows that he was there.³⁷ Castellio at Basel could only have heard that Servetus would have been put to the torture if Vandel had not intervened.³⁸ After the collapse of the Libertines the Genevan senate, as we have seen, attempted to discredit the exiles on the ground that they had favored Servetus.³⁹

Over against this may be placed the deposition of Trolliet (1558), the confidant of Perrin, to the fact that to his knowledge Vandel, Berthelier, and Perrin had not supported Servetus.⁴⁰

31 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 827-29.

32 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 742-43.

33 *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 623-24.

34 Michel Roset, *Les chroniques de Genève*, ed. Henri Fazy, Geneva, 1894, p. 355.

35 *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 657.

36 Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, *Anderweitiger Versuch einer vollständigen und unpartheyischen Ketzer-geschichte*, Helmstaedt, 1748, p. 449.

37 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 825.

38 *Contra Libellum Calvini*, 1612, Dij.

39 *Calvini Opera*, XX, 438.

40 Amédée Roget, *Histoire du peuple de Genève depuis la réforme jusqu'à l'escalade*, 7 vols. in 3, Geneva, 1870-1873, IV, appendix.

Vandel discountenanced a tract which criticized the treatment of Servetus,⁴¹ and F. D. Berthelier denied that he had expressed disapproval of the verdict.⁴² Bonivard said that after the replies from the Swiss cities the Libertines did not dare to give Servetus open support.⁴³

Nevertheless it would be precarious to press skepticism in this direction. Calvin's statement of what he had heard about Berthelier appears in the official records without a hint of contradiction, and one can scarcely feel that he was mistaken about Perrin's appeal to the Two Hundred, in spite of the silence of the official report. It is altogether possible that some of the Libertines did have one good deed to their credit. But the party as a whole did not. Rigot, who prosecuted Servetus, was himself a Perrinist, and no one would insist more strongly than M. Doumergue that he acted in entire independence of Calvin.⁴⁴

The third supposition is that the Libertines communicated with Servetus in prison. The evidence is circumstantial and conjectural. Farel said vaguely, "There were some who gave him to hope that there was no danger."⁴⁵ Beza recorded that one of the Libertines, an employee of the government, "was believed to have whispered in his ear."⁴⁶ Bonivard, however, thought that the information was supplied by Claude, the jailor.⁴⁷ This guess has the merit of leaving intact the assertion of Servetus, in the presence of his accusers, that he had communicated with no one save with those who gave him to eat.⁴⁸

The apologists find support for the above conjectures in circumstantial evidence. The windows of the prison were locked.⁴⁹ Why, we are asked, if not to prevent any further communication with the outside?⁵⁰ But the explanation is much simpler. Servetus testified that he had escaped at Vienne through a window.⁵¹ The Genevan authorities took the hint.

M. Doumergue discovers that as the trial progressed

41 *Ibid.*, IV, 167-68.

42 *Ibid.*, IV, 291 note 1.

43 François Bonivard, *Advis et devis de l'ancienne et nouvelle police de Geneve*, reprinted in Geneva, 1865, p. 108.

44 *Op. cit.*, VI, 326-27.

45 *Calvini Opera*, XIV, 693.

46 *Calvini Opera*, XXI, 146.

47 *Op. cit.*, p. 107. Cf. Rilliet, *Op. cit.*, p. 104, who suggests that Claude was suspect, because on October 23 Servetus was committed to other hands.

48 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 789.

49 *Ibid.*

50 Rilliet, *Op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

51 *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 746.

Servetus gave more precise information about Calvin's dealings with the inquisition at Vienne. This information must have been supplied by the Libertines⁵² M. Doumergue has apparently overlooked the fact that Servetus also gave increasingly precise information about his escape from Vienne.⁵³

Particular stress is laid on the fact that Servetus was sufficiently acquainted with the laws of Geneva to know that he could appeal to the Two Hundred. How did he discover that, unless he was informed during the course of the trial? As if the Two Hundred were an esoteric society of which one could not have learned at Vienne! For that matter Servetus said that he had been in Geneva before.⁵⁴

Even greater importance is attached to the coincidence that Servetus made the appeal on the fifteenth of September, while the Berthelier case was still pending. Could Servetus have divined the precise moment, we are asked, without aid from the outside?⁵⁵ The answer is that any moment within a month would have been equally precise. Calvin had scored his dramatic victory over Berthelier nearly two weeks before (September 3). A date in August would have been more timely.

But grant that there was communication, and it is by no means improbable, what then has been proved? Nothing more than that the Libertines made a secret attempt to save Servetus, as we have seen that they may have made a public attempt. If both be true, Servetus is not thereby convicted of sedition. This alone is established that there was a connection between the cases of Servetus and Berthelier, both of whom received help from the same quarter. M. Doumergue would contend that the connection was so intimate that had Calvin failed in the one he must have failed also in the other, with the consequent collapse of his entire work. The Genevan reformation was at stake. This is the reason why he was so implacable. This enables us to excuse his intolerance.⁵⁶

Not one of these suppositions seems to me probable. Had Berthelier been restored to communion, Calvin would have gone into exile, but Servetus would scarcely have been released after

⁵² *Op. cit.*, VI, 277. *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 732, 738, 789.

⁵³ *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 746, §5, 749, 789.

⁵⁴ *Calvini Opera*, VIII, 767, §4.

⁵⁵ Even Roget was impressed by this consideration. *Op. cit.*, IV, p. 76.

⁵⁶ Doumergue, *Op. cit.*, VI, 363-64; cf. 336, 340.

the verdict of the Swiss cities. The Genevan council could be inexorable enough without Calvin.⁵⁷ On the other hand, if Servetus had been released, Calvin need not have lost the victory already attained over Berthelier. Certainly it is far from the truth that a milder treatment of Servetus would have been the undoing of Calvin's work. On the contrary, this exercise of severity precipitated a prolonged and embarrassing controversy. Neither is it necessary to call in the Libertines to explain Calvin's implacable opposition. The honor of God was at stake. Calvin, like Servetus, gave less thought to the Libertines than to the Lord.

⁵⁷ Herbert Darling Foster, "Geneva before Calvin," in *American Historical Review*, VIII (1903), pp. 217-240, especially p. 231.

A CENTURY OF ARMENIAN PROTESTANTISM

LEON ARPEE

Athens, Ohio

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions appointed its first men to the Turkish empire in 1818. Five years afterward (1823) the Board's Syrian Mission was established at Beirut, where shortly two Armenian ecclesiastics were received into the Mission church as the first-fruits of American missionary labors in Turkey. In 1831 William Goodell, of the Syrian Mission established himself at Constantinople, where he was joined the following year by a new recruit, Henry Dwight. These men were under instructions to devote themselves to Armenian work in the Turkish capital. Thus was begun the Board's Armenian Mission.

At this time there was an appreciable religious awakening among Constantinople Armenians, the Academy at the Armenian Patriarchate (opened in 1827) being the main agency in the promotion of the movement. The distinguished principal of this school, Peshtimaljian, was a layman of wide learning, author of several important educational works, and given to evangelical views. Among his students the missionaries found some of their warmest friends, notably John Der-Sahakian, the missionaries' first convert at Constantinople, who was afterward (1843-48) educated in the United States, and served as pastor of Protestant churches at Adabazar, Hasskeuy, Bardezag and Nicomedia, until his death in 1865.

In the fall of 1834 Sahakian was appointed superintendent of a short-lived mission high school in the Pera quarter of Constantinople. In 1836, with him as secretary, the Evangelical Union was organized, a secret society, in everything but name a church, which soon carried on a voluminous correspondence with the provinces. The organization, just a hundred years ago, of the Evangelical Union, marks the beginning of Armenian Protestantism.

In 1839 a persecution followed, and Sahakian was exiled

to Cesarea in Asia Minor, the diplomatic situation at that juncture offering no impediment to a persecution. The diplomatic corps to the last man were either indifferent or openly hostile to American missionaries in Turkey, while the American chargé d'affaires, Commodore Porter, entertained ideas of the Turkish-American Treaty of Commerce (1830) which completely ruled out all missionary enterprise.

This persecution, however, soon came to an abrupt end. Sultan Mahmud, by whose sanction the persecutors had done their work, died, and the invasion of Asia Minor by Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt gave the Turks a diversion. A period of increased missionary activity ensued, marked by open controversy through the lecture room and the press. In 1840 a mission high school was opened at Bebek, on the Bosphorus, Cyrus Hamlin in charge. The position of the missionaries was strengthened in 1842 by a note from Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, to Commodore Porter at Constantinople, instructing him to protect the missionaries just as he would any other citizens of the United States.

Soon, however, a second and more violent persecution followed. The first victim was Vertanes Esnak Gregorian, a priest of Nicomedia (Ismid), who since 1840 had been residing at or near the capital, and once previously had attracted the hostile eye of the ecclesiastical authorities. On Sunday, January 25, 1846, at the close of the morning's service, and before the mass, the patriarchal church was darkened, the great screen drawn before the altar, and a solemn bull of excision and anathema launched against all "modern sectaries," and in particular against Vertanes, who was styled "a devil and a child of the Devil," "a traitor and murderer of Christ," and "a house destroying and ravening wolf." Believers were forbidden to have any social or business dealings with the "new sectaries," whose houses and shops were placed equally under the ban. In the course of the ensuing four weeks the evangelicals were one by one called to the patriarchate and required under anathema to subscribe to nine test points of doctrine. Some thirty evangelicals who refused to subscribe their names during that time were excommunicated by name and delivered up to Satan, with the result that some thirty-five individuals at the capital lost their licenses to trade, and about twice that number were driven from their homes. Acute destitution ensued, relieved

only by the charities of sympathizers in Europe and America. Social and business ostracism continued long after the ecclesiastical ban was removed, and prevailed longer in the provincial towns than at the capital. Over a period of some twelve years, a great-grandfather of the writer, living in Nicomedia, a city by no means destitute of foreign diplomatic oversight, consumed a considerable fortune sustaining his married children with their families condemned to forcible idleness.

On June 21, 1846, a bull of perpetual excommunication and anathema was published by the patriarch, barring all Protestants forever from membership in the Holy Church. This served as the signal for organizing Protestant churches. On July 1, 1846, the First Church of Constantinople was formed at Pera. In this month and the following churches were also organized at Nicomedia, Adabazar and Trebizond. The aggregate communicant membership of these four churches at the end of a year was about 140, and the entire Protestant community numbered but a little over a thousand. An Imperial iradè of November 15, 1847, granted freedom of conscience to the Protestant community of the land. By an imperial firman of November 27, 1850, the community's status as a "nation" was permanently confirmed.

Churches were organized during the first ten years of the evangelical movement as follows: 1846—Constantinople First, Nicomedia, Adabazar, Trebizond; 1847—Erzrum; 1848—Aintab, Brusa; 1850—Constantinople Second; 1851—Diarbekir, Sivas; 1852—Constantinople Third, Aleppo, Killis, Rodosto; 1853—Smyrna, Kessab, Marsovan; 1854—Cesarea, Arabkir, Akhissar, Tocat, Marash; 1855—Mashker (near Harput), Divrik, Adana. The growth of the Aintab field (including Marash, Kessab, Killis, Urfa and Adana) was especially phenomenal. In this field by 1850 the number of Protestants equalled, perhaps exceeded, that of all the rest of the empire.

The rate of planting churches in the ensuing twenty years was not so rapid: 1856—Harput, Khnus; 1861—Aidin; 1863—Diarbekir; 1864—Bitlis, Malatia; 1870—Gurun; 1871—Zeitun; 1872—Hadjin; 1876—Van.

Territorial organizations were effected as follows: 1864—the Bithynia Union, and the Aintab Presbyterial Assembly; 1865—the Harput Evangelical Union; 1868—the Central Evangelical Union; 1872—the Cilicia Union.

The expansion of the work cannot be fully estimated without viewing the parallel growth of the American missionary enterprise in Turkey. In 1850 American missions in Turkey had seven stations (Constantinople, Bebek, Brusa, Smyrna, Trebizond, Erzurum and Aintab), with eighteen missionaries, six native pastors and preachers, and eight churches with a total communicant membership of about 240. By 1860 the field had been subdivided into three Missions, the Western, the Central and the Eastern. In the latter year there were 23 stations, over 100 missionaries, male and female, 40 pastors and preachers, and the same number of evangelical churches with a total communicant membership of approximately 1300 souls. By the year 1890 the Turkish Missions of the American Board were a one-third interest, having one-third of its converts throughout the world, employing one-third of its force and its funds, and contributing one-third of all native gifts. This position they maintained to the end.

During the period from 1819 to 1896, or from the beginning until the first great Armenian massacres, the Board expended on its Turkish Missions approximately \$7,000,000, and employed 700 missionaries. In 1896 the valuation of the mission plant was \$1,500,000. At the outbreak of the World War it was stated that the American Board's investments in Turkey during the 96 years of operation aggregated \$20,000,000. Lands, buildings and equipment were valued at \$2,000,000, while the annual appropriations for operating expenses were \$360,000. The Turkish Missions Aid Society, organized in England in 1854, and renamed in 1893 The Bible Lands Missions Aid Society, an agency interdenominational in character, numbering among its patrons both churchmen and non-conformists, also rendered material aid, contributing in the 50 years preceding 1905, for *native work* in the Near East, over \$540,000, of which \$335,000 went for work in Asia Minor and European Turkey.

In 1914, on the eve of the World War, the Board had 15 stations in Turkey, and 146 missionaries; there were 179 native ministers, 137 churches, 13,891 communicants, and 50,900 adherents. With the last figure closely tallies that of the Archbishop Ormanian in his diocesan statistics for 1910, namely, 49,050, which he gives as the number of Protestants throughout the territorial bounds of the Armenian church in Turkey.

Each Mission of the three had its own theological school, the Western at Bebek (Constantinople), and later (1865) at Marsovan; the Central at Aintab, later (1865) at Marash, and the Eastern at Tocat, later (1859) at Harput. In the 'nineties, an appreciable number of candidates for the priesthood of the old church were attending the Mission Seminary at Marash, some of them paying their own way.

The educational work of the Board proved of greater importance than the Board itself had fairly anticipated. The example set by Robert College, named for Christopher R. Robert, a New York merchant and original donor, founded by Cyrus Hamlin (1871) at Rumeli Hissar, on the Bosphorus, was followed by the Board at other points. Colleges were opened as follows: Central Turkey College at Aintab, 1874; Euphrates College at Harput, 1876; Anatolia College at Marsovan, 1886; International College at Smyrna, 1902, and St. Paul's Institute at Tarsus, 1904. Four of these Colleges, Euphrates, Central Turkey, Anatolia and St. Paul's, had endowments on the eve of the World War aggregating over \$300,000. Funds were being raised for a college at Van when the War broke out.

The missionaries were pioneers of female education. The first Armenian girls' boarding school was opened by a Miss Lovell at Pera in 1845. In 1868 the Ely sisters took charge of a girls' boarding school at Bitlis, founded two years previously. For many years, and well up to the eve of the Great War, they conducted the only boarding school for girls in that whole region. A similar school was opened in 1868 at Marsovan, followed in 1871 by a Home School at Scutari (Constantinople), whose first building was erected in 1875-76. This school in 1890 became the American College for Girls at Constantinople, removed in 1914 to the opposite shore of the Bosphorus and renamed Constantinople College. In 1874 a girls' school was opened in Nicomedia which later was removed to Bardezag, across the Bay, and in 1886 to Adabazar. In 1880 the people of Marash gave \$2,250 for a girls' seminary, which in 1886 was opened under the name of the Central Turkey College for Girls. In 1881 the Collegiate Institute for Girls was founded at Smyrna. The first kindergarten in the country was opened in 1884 as a department of this institution by a Miss Bartlett, daughter of a missionary.

The deepest and most enduring single evangelical influence

upon the Armenians of Turkey at large came from the combined work of the American Board and the American Bible Society in disseminating the scriptures in the people's vernacular, notably Goodell's Bible for Turkish speaking Armenians published in 1842, and Elias Riggs' Modern Armenian Bible published in 1853. In the early 'seventies some 30,000 copies of the Bible were sold annually in the empire. It was estimated that not far from 300,000 Bibles were in daily use. Three Bible women of Cesarea visiting 860 families of that city reported finding Bibles in 763 of them. By the 'eighties relations between the old church and evangelical communions were cordial enough to admit of collaboration on a Modern Armenian New Testament published under the patriarch's *imprimatur* to secure its free circulation among his people (1882).

The government always regarded Protestant building enterprises with jealousy, and one of the greatest handicaps of the churches was in their lack of proper housing. In 1878 the church at Cesarea dedicated a house of worship erected by government firman with funds collected by the pastor in Scotland. It was said to be the first church building worthy the name erected by Protestants of Turkey. Almost the last church to own a fit place of worship was the mother church at the capital, where the government was from the beginning especially hostile to the erection of Protestant churches. The site had been purchased in the year of organization (1846). The firman for the building was issued in 1904, and the edifice dedicated in 1907. The American Bible Society in 1873 dedicated in Constantinople a Bible House, which was used as headquarters for all Protestant missionary agencies at the capital and served to lend Protestantism a prestige it had not formerly enjoyed.

The success of the evangelical work in Turkey was in good part owing to that fine body of native preachers and pastors that the mission developed. We have space for but a few of the most representative men. John Concordance, a blind evangelist, was celebrated for his readiness in quoting scripture by chapter and verse. He died in 1869. He was a native of the Arabkir district, a graduate of the Harput Seminary, and labored at Havadorig, a mountain village near Mush. A tract from his pen on tithing was translated into English and several other languages, and read the world over, the American Board

alone circulating 90,000 copies. Simon Davidian, who was born at Dalvorig, in the Armenian province of Sasun, labored at Khnus, Tchévirmé, Mush and Bitlis. "A man of originality of character, extraordinary learning and great practical ability." He died in 1894, aged 84 years, crushed by the news of the Sasun massacres, leaving a fragrant name for sanctity and service. Thomas Boyajian was ordained at Diarbekir in 1863. In 1867 he was in the United States soliciting funds for a church building. He served also as British consul and died in 1895. "Probably no Armenian in the interior of Turkey had a higher reputation than he. He was a man of noble character, a very eloquent preacher, and a successful diplomat withal." Harutun Jenanyan, an educator, founded academies at Tarsus and Iconium. Revivalist from 1889 onward, he labored at Aintab, Marash, Adana, Cesarea, Talas, Yozgat, Istanos and Sivas. He was said to show great skill in adapting modern revival methods to the conditions of the land.

Noteworthy revivals swept over the Armenian field from time to time. Under the labors of a grandmother of the writer there was a revival at Bardezag, in the Nicomedia district, in 1866, when that congregation quadrupled. In 1866-67 there were revivals at Marash and Harput. The latter congregation in twenty years gave to the church at large seven ministers of the gospel. There was an awakening at Bitlis in 1866, and again in 1870, and in 1876. In 1889 Aintab had a revival which spread to Marash, Hadjin, Adana and Cesarea. Another revival swept over the Central Turkey field in 1902-3, including Aintab, Marash, Hadjin, Adana, Tarsus, Killis, Aleppo and Urfa. Students and professors at Aintab College were active workers in this revival, "attended by such numbers of people that it attracted the attention of the government, and at the instigation of enemies an order was issued restricting the number of public meetings to three in each week." A considerable number of Jews are said to have asked for baptism during this revival.

The Protestant movement was not without its direct influence upon the old church and community. It could be said of Marash in 1863, "Drunkenness and superstition are diminishing; thousands have been led to see the emptiness of their dead forms of worship, who are not ready to espouse the cause of despised Protestantism." Another wrote in 1871, "There is a

great work going on in Aintab among the Armenians, outside of the Protestant congregations. I was surprised to find so many Armenians who are evangelical in sentiment." In the latter year the bishop of Amasia swept two churches of their silver and gold plate, and appropriated the proceeds from their sale for the building of school houses and the support of teachers.

Reform societies were organized by old school Armenians in various places. In 1865 there was formed at Harput a society having for its avowed object the reforming of the church and the maintenance of preaching. In 1868 there came into being at Cesarea a society whose members, though bitterly opposed to Protestantism, were themselves Protestants in all but name, seeking to enlighten the church from within. This society continued until 1885, when it was suppressed by the government. In 1883 there flourished at Marash a strong reform society demanding the discarding of church pictures and the liturgy in the ancient tongue, and advocating Bible preaching by the clergy.

Sporadic revivals even occurred. In 1884 there was an old church youths' revival at Sivas, with prayer meetings morning and night at which so many were anxious to pray that their leader, we are told, could hardly find time to speak. Most striking, if not most influential, was the movement of "Lovists" at Yarpuz and Zeitun, who held revival meetings marked by great fervor, proclaiming salvation by Christ alone. At the last-named place these Lovists had hundreds of enrolled members. Before long, however, they ran into erratic extremes, claiming the gift of prophecy and seeing visions. The movement was finally crushed out by the hierarchy in 1890 after running its course for about ten years.

It cannot be said, however, that the Armenian people as a whole took kindly to Protestantism. Why did not Protestantism make the same sort of headway among the Armenians of the nineteenth century that it made, for example, among the Germans of the sixteenth? The following circumstances will help to explain. In general, the Armenians of the nineteenth century were not so well educated as the German people in the sixteenth. Secondly, the Protestant reformation among the Armenians, in part owing to a desire of the mission to keep down the expenses, failed to develop the type of native leader-

ship essential to the success of great movements. Further, the Armenians, unlike the Germans, were a people scattered among alien races, living under hostile governments that watched every movement among them with an unfriendly eye. Finally, the grievances of the German people of the sixteenth century against a foreign pope were numerous and real, and their revolt political as well as religious, while the Protestant reformation among the Armenians was entirely spiritual in character, and the Armenian masses far from having any grievance against their own church, viewed its disruption as the one thing at all costs to be avoided. Hence for the same reason that the Armenians had once refused to be absorbed by the Greek church, and later by the Latin, they now refused to turn Protestants.

As between the American Mission and the native Protestant church, it was not to be expected that they would always see eye to eye. "Growing pains," such as have been reported in late years in other parts of the world field, early seized upon the Armenian evangelical churches. Where points of view were different, controversy was bound to arise. The missionary was an agent of a Board some 7,000 miles away, and viewed the interests of his Board, and his own responsibility to it, as paramount. The native pastor, on the other hand, first and last thought of his own people, and regarded the Board and its missionaries as but a means to an end. The viewpoints were each the exact reverse of the other, and only men of tact and discernment on both sides could sense the underlying unity of aim.

Some of the more radical missionaries seemed to believe that the best way to avoid trouble was to show the churches their place beforehand, that place being conceived as one of subseriency to the Mission. When in 1864 the Aintab Evangelical Union was formed, an article was inserted into the constitution fixing the position of the native church as one of subordination. Whenever in the judgment of the missionaries it became necessary for them to act in matters relating to the formation of churches, and the licensure, ordination and installation of ministers, without calling a regular meeting of the native ecclesiastical body, they were to be regarded as having the right to do so. It was also provided that the Union was to have no control over the funds in the hands of the missionaries.

In a field like the Aintab district, this attitude of the Mission perhaps was feasible. The people there were simple folk,

Turkish-speaking, devoid of that national pride characteristic of the Armenian-speaking majority of the north, looking up to the missionary and trusting him implicitly. In the north, on the other hand, while finances played their part in the controversy, the real root of bitterness lay in a highly developed national consciousness, and a commendable desire to assert the rights and assume the responsibilities of a native church, which, it was conceived, the missionaries inclined to hold too long under tutelage.

It was but a symptom of this insubordination of the native church to the Mission that certain young men of ability, finding that they would not be permitted to work with the missionaries on equal terms, sought an education abroad, to return to the homeland as representatives of such groups as would send them back to their own country with the status of missionaries. Thus Shishmanian, for example, returned representing the Disciples of Christ, and Hayguni representing the Baptists of the United States (1881); Dobrashian was sent out as a medical missionary by the English Quakers (1882); Gabrielian labored for a time under the auspices of the American Baptists (1883); and Jenanyan worked independently (1888). Defections of congregations had the same motive. The first Church of Constantinople would have gone over in 1864 to the English Episcopal church had it met with encouragement from the Church Missionary Society; a faction of the Diarkbekir church for a time (1873-75) actually turned Episcopalian.

In 1882 the American Board finally took notice of the controversy and appointed a deputation to study the problem on the ground. This deputation was at Constantinople in the spring of the following year; it was composed of two committees working independently of each other, one representing the Board's temporary committee, the other the Prudential Committee, or permanent executive committee. At a conference of this deputation with the missionaries the following resolutions were adopted:

That we continue to recognize the Evangelical churches of Turkey as the chief agency for its evangelization, and ourselves as their helpers and co-workers in the Gospel, and especially that we accord to the preachers and the pastors of these churches all fraternal honor and affection.

That in all our work, evangelistic, educational, or literary, the same weight is to be given to native opinion as to missionary opinion, and that

the work be prosecuted so as to secure, as far as possible, the concurrence of churches or brethren directly concerned and competent to judge in the premises; and we recommend that, as soon as possible, the stations give to brethren whose relations to the work render it suitable an equal responsibility and voice with themselves, as is now done in some cases in school boards, in literary works. etc.

It was also resolved that in places where native contributions approximated one-half the expense of the work, the entire care of evangelism should be left to the churches.

Pursuant to these principles, there were formed in 1884 "conferences" composed of missionaries and representatives of the native churches, one in each mission station. The results obtained were pronounced of "the happiest." Chambers, the missionary at Erzurum, two years afterward declared, "Every year I am more and more convinced of the wisdom of this co-operative move and astonished that there should have been fears entertained of its success." The Board itself was highly gratified with the new move. "The conferences of the missionaries with representatives of the native churches," it was said, "have been most helpful to both parties, and have inspired a mutual respect and regard of greatest moment to the welfare of the common cause."

Now when a son becomes conscious of his own equality with his father, it is about time for him to think seriously of self-support. And indeed the native churches were not unmindful of their duty and privilege in this matter. In 1860 the First and Second churches of Constantinople consolidated and assumed self-support. Adabazar followed suit in 1862, Harput in 1865, the churches of Marash in 1874, Marsovan in 1879, Tarsus in 1893. Many smaller churches did the same thing from time to time. In 1870, in the destitute Chunkush region northwest of Diarbekir, there were not less than eight churches entirely self-supporting, and eight others were nearly so. With ever increasing emphasis the goal of complete independence of mission aid was held steadily in the view of the native churches. In the Central Turkey field the home missionary society planned to assume a growing measure of the burden of self-support until by 1920 the churches should be entirely independent of foreign aid.

Out of their poverty, the evangelical churches contributed to the work of sending the gospel to less favored communities.

The region about Farkin, beyond Diarbekir, was inhabited by a population of Kurdish-speaking Armenians. The district, comprising a hundred small towns, was in utter spiritual destitution. There was no resident priest there, but once a year one visited the region to baptize the children and to bless the graves of the dead. A "Mission to Kurdistan" was organized at Harput, and adopted afterward by the entire church. In 1868 seven young men educated at Marash at the church's expense were sent out to bring the gospel to this community. Kavmè Ablahatian, of Syrian extraction, the best known missionary to this field, toiled at Redvan 1876-88. By the year 1904 this work was entirely independent of the Board. In this year also the whole of the New Testament translated into Kurdish was ready for the press.

In the face of adverse conditions the liberality of the churches was constant. The missionary Greene, on furlough in the United States in 1869, published a comparative table of gifts of the Armenian churches, and the churches equal in number of a single denomination in a Western state, which was not flattering to the American churches. In 1902-3 the native gifts for all purposes within the bounds of the Western Turkey Mission were \$66,652, \$48,806 being for education. In Central Turkey native contributions in the same year totaled \$17,657, "more than half of it for education." At Aintab there were four old-school Armenians to one Protestant; as to property per man, the two communions averaged about the same. Yet the Protestants during 1880 gave for preaching, education, poor-relief and other purely benevolent objects more than twice as much as the old school Armenians, or eight times as much *per capita*. "Never before," writes a missionary, "have I seen a more utterly disheartening state of things, physical, political, economic, yet have I never seen among the different communities such earnestness, such painful self-denial, which in many cases amounts to pure heroism, as during the past year. These people amaze me!" Harput in 1893 contributed for congregational and missionary purposes the sum of \$7,709. An additional \$4,523 for education brought up the total to \$12,232, contributed "in a famine year, 'in His name'." Tithing was not uncommon among the churches, notably Harput, Marash, and Marsovan.

Several adverse circumstances, however, interfered with

the plans for "a self-supporting church." Pestilence decimated the churches. In the summer of 1865 the cholera raged in Constantinople, carrying off with its 50,000 victims the civil head of the Protestant community. In the summer of 1875 there was a plague of cholera at Antioch, Damascus, and Aintab, in which last place alone 2,000 perished. Famines were not infrequent in the land. During a famine in Asia Minor in 1874, 150,000 are estimated to have died. In the year following, the missionaries at Cesarea were feeding 100,000 persons, their home churches contributing heavily toward the \$125,000 expended for relief, which means that considerable money that might have been spent for evangelism went to feeding the hungry, of whom ninety-five per cent were shiftless Moslems. There was another famine in 1880 in the regions of Diarbekir, Harput, Erzurum, and Van. In the Erzurum district in this year forty Kurds died to one Christian, and probably an equal proportion received relief. A third famine visited Asia Minor and Armenia in 1887. Government oppression also crippled the churches. For example, at Marash it took two months' labor each year to pay the government taxes, while the Protestant community of the city was levied upon for \$800 annually when their church property was only valued at \$2,500, and one wonders how the poor congregation was able to raise \$500 additional each year for the gospel. At Harput the government exacted from ten to fifteen per cent on land alone. In 1877 the missionary at Talas wrote, "The collectors take the last cow, sheep or goat, and even cooking utensils, and the last bed from the poor peasants, and there is no appeal." In 1880, when the revenue of Turkey was one-fifth that of the United States, the allowance of the sultan and his entourage was \$5,720,000, or one hundred and fourteen times the salary of the president of the United States. In war and peace massacres of the Christian population took their toll. The massacres of 1877, of 1895-96, and of 1908, drained the congregations of some of their best blood, until finally the butcheries and deportations of 1915 swept the Armenian race, and with it the evangelical churches, out of Asia Minor. Last of all, emigration. So early as the year 1867 the tide of emigration from the Bitlis region of Armenia to the United States was on the move. By 1880 the emigrant flow out of the country, mostly to the United States, was at the flood stage. Large numbers of young men five years later were leav-

ing the Harput region in search of work in America. And so late as the year 1907, on a single day some forty, many of them Protestants, left that city for the New World. "Much of the vigor and resources of our communities," wrote a missionary, "have been transferred to America by the constant stream of emigration; some of our churches have lost fully half their strength; some count their losses by scores, others by hundreds."

The antagonism of the Turkish government to the American Mission never was from the beginning in doubt. The missionaries' avowed purpose to use work among the native Christians of Turkey as but a stepping stone to Moslem work exasperated the Porte, and contributed to the latter's resolve to eliminate both missionaries and native Christians when the time should be opportune.

Following the Treaty of Paris concluding the Crimean War, and encouraged by what seemed to be the dawn of a new era of religious toleration, a number of Turks embraced Christianity. About 1857 a Turk by the name of Ahmed, with his wife and three little daughters, was converted at Cesarea. In 1860 six Moslem converts were baptized at the capital, one of them being an aged *imam*, and by the end of the following year the whole number of Turks baptized at Constantinople reached twenty-three. Somewhat less than half a hundred Turks altogether were converted; the Jesuits baptized approximately the same number throughout the country. But in 1864 the Turkish government was already employing restraining measures, and that, too, with the sanction and support of the British ambassador, Sir Henry Bulwer. Ten years later the Grand Vizier definitively declared that the *Hatti Humayoun* provision for religious toleration did not contemplate Moslems.

Thereafter Moslem work was confined to the publication of the scriptures in Turkish. In the five years preceding 1878, when a complete Turkish Bible was published, some 17,000 copies and parts of the New Testament in Turkish were sold from the Bible House at Constantinople, "mainly to Moslems." For his share in this work, the missionary Parsons, of Bardezag, paid with his life in 1880. He was murdered with his Armenian servant in the open field in his sleep by agents of an *imam* to whom he had offered a Bible for sale. The assassins were arrested, identified, tried, convicted, imprisoned for a short time, and set free again by Hamid's government.

"The government," said a committee chairman who once had served as American consul in Turkey, at the annual meeting of the American Board in 1887, "feels its power gradually declining, and its empire crumbling away, and just in that proportion has it determined to resist more persistently every kind of interference from the civilized world." The suppression or suspension of newspapers, the closing of schools, the refusal of permits to erect school houses or places of worship, and the preventing of land from passing into the hands of the missions were among the forms which this hostility assumed.

In 1893 the mission girls' school at Marsovan was burned down by incendiaries. Professors Thoumaian and Kayayan, of the American College there, were arrested, tried and sentenced to death for alleged revolutionary activities, and afterward "pardoned" and expelled from the country. In 1895 mission property was burned at Harput, the loss being estimated at \$88,000. In the same year the mission seminary at Marash was burned by soldiers, the personnel of the mission being at the same time attacked. Meanwhile missionaries' touring rights were challenged. In 1894 Frederick Greene, missionary at Van, was expelled from the country. Two years later (1896) the younger Knapp, missionary at Bitlis, was arrested, taken to Alexandretta under guard, and shipped to Constantinople with a passport stamped "Expelled." It was affirmed that the missionary had "indulged in all sorts of subversive intrigues." His real misdemeanor consisted in having aided in relief distribution among the doomed Armenians of Sasun, and in having been a foreign witness of Turkish barbarities whose testimony in future to investigating commissions might prove embarrassing to the government.

The American Congress in the face of these hostile acts early in 1895 made an appropriation of funds for consuls to be stationed at Erzurum and Harput. In 1901 the Turks were forced to pay indemnities at Washington for past losses sustained by the missions. In the same year the French seized the port of Mitylene to enforce demands of their own, and in 1904 President Roosevelt dispatched a fleet to Turkish waters to reinforce demands under the "most favored nations clause," based upon concessions to the French government. Matters were finally settled in 1907 by the sultan issuing an *iradè* recognizing all American institutions and residences in Turkey

as lawfully established, and permitting the corporate ownership of mission property.

The *rapprochement* between England and Russia in this year seemed to bode no good for Turkey. The Young Turks took the alarm and by a *coup d' état* of July 24, 1908, Abdul Hamid was forced to restore the old Constitution, an event which raised extravagant expectations among both natives and foreigners. A sanguine missionary at Cesarea exclaimed, "This is nothing other than the birth of a genuine Ottoman nation. The Turks may surpass the Armenians in their appreciation of and devotion to the principles of real liberty and genuine civilization." More discerning minds abroad, however, had perceived that the Young Turks were rabid chauvinists in whose vocabulary "union" and "progress" meant but the casting of all Turkish nationalities into the Moslem mould. Following a parlor lecture delivered in London, in 1904, by Ahmed Riza Bey, afterward President of the Turkish Chamber, one of those present said, "I am not sorry that the gentleman has spoken, because it shows us how impossible it is to expect any reforms in Turkey from the Young Turkish party. They are only thinking of themselves. The liberties of the Christians would be just as unsafe under a Sultan with the sentiments of the gentleman who has just sat down, as under the present Sultan."

How genuine was the conversion of Turkey at the "revolution" became shortly apparent when in the province of Adana (Cilicia), in April, 1909, 30,000 Armenians were done to death. Twenty-six leaders of thirty-three different Protestant congregations, including six lay delegates, were caught on their way to an annual meeting of the Evangelical Union at Adana City, and slain. "The large, prosperous church of Adana was reduced to dependence, losing 120 of its congregation, its church, school and parsonage, and sustaining private losses to the amount of nearly \$400,000." The losses of the national churches were proportionately greater, though no figures are here available. The Young Turks laid the blame for the Adana horrors on the sultan, whom they deposed; but a second massacre in the same month perpetrated by troops from Macedonia officered by Young Turks brought over "to restore order," pointed clearly in the other direction. The province of Adana had enjoyed immunity during the massacres of 1895-96, and the Young Turks saw to it now that it was given a taste of blood.

The massacres and deportations of Armenians at the beginning of the World War (1915) are too familiar through British Blue Books, other war-time publications, and novels, to need recital here. The atrocities accompanying the great conflict reduced the number of Armenians in Asia Minor by one-half, and drove the survivors out of Turkey to lands adjoining and beyond the seas. The belligerent powers on both sides directly contributed to the elimination of approximately three millions of Christians, Armenian and Greek, from Asia Minor. The American Board liquidated its hundred years' interests in the country, and withdrew from the field.

How much is left of Armenian Protestantism from the great cataclysm may be conveyed by a few figures. At the beginning of the War, in 1914, there were in the three Missions of the American Board in Turkey some 150 missionaries, 1,200 native workers, and 137 organized churches with annual contributions for religious and educational purposes reaching a total of \$200,000. In 1918, or immediately after the War in Europe, there were but 36 missionaries in the field, while in the whole extent of Asia Minor not more than 200 out of the original total of 1,200 native workers were found alive. Churches, schools and hospitals, with the exception of those at Constantinople and Smyrna, were closed or wiped out of existence.

A later investigation, in 1925, revealed not more than 15 organized Armenian Protestant churches throughout Turkey and Greece, and fewer than two dozen in Syria. In the two countries first named there were 1,498 communicants, with a total constituency of 12,101, these figures, however, embracing Greek evangelical churches as well as the Armenian. In Syria there were 1,502 communicants, and a constituency of 11,980. This makes a grand total of 3,000 communicants as against 13,000, and 24,081 adherents as against an approximate 50,000, before the War. The native contributions in Turkey and Greece in 1925 totaled \$103,208, of which \$95,668 was for education, while in Syria the refugee churches contributed a total of \$14,776, \$8,126 of it being for education. In this same year there were four or five evangelical churches in the Caucasus, growing by constant accessions of straggling refugees.

At the present writing the geographical distribution of the refugee churches throughout the world is as follows. Most of the Cilician Armenians having fled in 1921-23 to adjoining ter-

ritory in Syria, the old Cilicia Union was there reorganized as the Armenian Evangelical Union of Syria and the Lebanon. The Union has 22 member churches, with a communicant membership of about 2,500. A School of Theology is conducted for the training of ministers at Beirut jointly by the American Board and the Presbyterian Board. There are refugee churches also at Jaffa and Jerusalem, in Palestine, and strong churches in Cairo and Alexandria. There are four organized churches in Athens and Piraeus, in Greece, and one at Salonica, which has just acquired a building of its own, and there are three or four churches in Bulgaria, notably at Sofia and at Varna. Three unorganized congregations of not more than thirty members each are all that remain in Asia Minor, one at Adana, another at Cesarea, and a third at Marsovan. There are also three churches in Constantinople, with three preaching stations in the suburbs. The evangelicals are active in Soviet Armenia, where two former Harput ministers among others are laboring, and there are Protestant Armenian groups and workers in Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles, in France, in which last-named city a religious paper is also published. In the New World, refugee churches exist at Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and Montevideo. Some of these congregations, mostly those in Syria, have been helped by the Council of Armenian Missions, made up of representatives of the American Board and the Armenian Evangelical Churches of America. My informant, the Rev. Henry H. Riggs, of Beirut, says, "This year (1935) their total grant to Syria and Greece was less than \$12,000."

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH OF AFRICA ON THE EVE OF THE VANDAL INVASION

R. PIERCE BEAVER

Baltimore, Maryland

In Saint Augustine's time two theories concerning the origin of the church of Africa were current in Africa and Italy: either the Carthaginian church had been founded by missionaries from the church of Rome¹ or the Gospel had been brought from various eastern lands.² Carthage was undoubtedly the center from which Christianity spread throughout the whole of North Africa. As the number of converts increased and the churches multiplied, the same problems of organization arose and were solved as in other parts of the Empire,³ and ecclesiastical administration followed the lines of demarcation used by the civil power. Under Diocletian a reorganization of the imperial administrative scheme had taken place, and the Diocese of Africa, extending from Cyrenaica on the East to the Malva and Mount Atlas on the West,⁴ was comprised of the provinces of Tripolitana, Byzacenum, Proconsular Africa, Numidia,⁵ Mauretania Sitifiensis, and Mauretania Caesariensis. The district to the West, Mauretania Tingitana, was attached to the Diocese of Spain. By the end of the fourth century the church had created six provinces following the same lines,⁶ with the exception that Tingitana, although not a part of Africa politically formed a part of the ecclesiastical province of Mauretania Caesariensis.⁷ The last province to be created was Mauretania

1 Innocent I, *Ep.* 25.2 (*PL*, v. 20, p. 551).

2 Augustine, *Ep.* 43.7 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 90).

3 *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, v. I (1), p. 583.

4 Between this point and Tingitana stretched several hundred miles of roadless desert, forming a natural boundary.

5 Under Diocletian, this province had been divided into Proconsular Numidia with its capital at Cirta, and Military Numidia with Lambesis as its capital. Under Constantine, the two were again united with the capital at Cirta, which was now renamed Constantine.

6 For the exact boundaries, see Ferrère, *La situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine depuis la fin du IV^e siècle jusqu'à l'invasion des Vandales*, pp. 7-8; *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), pp. 582-583; v. IX (1), pp. 1251-1258, 1302-1306, 1335-1336.

7 *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 583; v. IX (1), p. 1342; Schwartz, *Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung der afrikanischen Kirche*, p. 20; Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

Sitifiensis, which was granted a primate by the Council of Hippo in 393.⁸

No other region of the Empire had as many bishoprics as North Africa.⁹ Nearly every town, and many *fundi* and *castella* as well,¹⁰ was a bishop's seat, and "diocese" and "*civitas*" were practically synonymous.¹¹ The ancient practice of having a bishop for each congregation still held to a large extent, and many a bishop was little more than a parish priest with episcopal powers. Moreover, the less important sees scattered through the rural districts were not always permanent, and on the death of an incumbent his successor might not be chosen, thus causing the extinction of that see; while at the same time another bishopric might be created elsewhere to meet the needs of a community,¹² or as the result of the successful intrigue of an ambitious priest.¹³ The demands for new sees resulting from the love of independence or from ambition were so numerous that the African Council declared that no more dioceses should be created excepting in those districts where the actual progress of the faith made it truly necessary.¹⁴ The Donatist schism practically doubled the number of sees in Africa, setting up "altar against altar"¹⁵ and bishop against bishop in each city,¹⁶ although the estates where bishops were found were definitely Catholic, Donatist, or pagan. Rival Donatist sects added to the confusion, as well as the Arian church established by the invading Vandals. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that the list of episcopal sees has been carried to more than 700.¹⁷ Even allowing for the duplication of dioceses due to schism, the number is exceedingly large. Several valuable Catholic episcopal lists exist, but

8 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. I, can. 3 (Mansi, v. III, p. 919); Hefele, *Counciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 52.

9 *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 583-584; Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 15; Baxter, *Select Letters of Saint Augustine*, pp. xxxi-xxxii.

10 *Gesta Collat. Carthag.*, die I, cap. 181 (Mansi, v. IV, pp. 24, 136); Ferrère, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-16.

11 Augustine, *Ep.* 34.5 (*CSEL*, v. 34(2), p. 26).

12 Augustine, *Ep.* 209.2 (*CSEL*, v. 57, p. 348).

13 Council of Carthage of 397, can. 5; *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africae*, can. 53 (Mansi, v. III, p. 928; pp. 742-743); Hefele, *Counciliengeschichte*, v. II, pp. 63, 116.

14 Third Council of Carthage, can. 5 (Mansi, v. III, p. 928).

15 Augustine, *Ep.* 43.17 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 99), *altare contra altare levatum est*.

16 *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 586; Baxter, *Sel. Letters of St. Aug.*, p. xxxi.

17 Dupin counted 690; Morelli gives 720; Leclercq enumerates about 726 sees. See Leclercq's article in *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. IX (1), pp. 1251-1342; and Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

they have suffered at the hands of copyists and commentators.¹⁸ Ferrère has compiled from available sources a list of Catholic sees numbering five hundred ninety-four.¹⁹ The Donatist church was in the ascendancy when Saint Augustine became bishop of Hippo, and probably had the larger number of prelates. Possidius informs us that there was then a sad lack of clergy in the Catholic church, and that this deficiency was so corrected by Augustine's work and influence that at the time of his death the church was well supplied with properly educated bishops, priests, and other clergy.²⁰ By 411 the two rival churches were again quite evenly matched, at least in their episcopal organization, and the greater number of bishops of each party must have attended the great conference at Carthage in that year.²¹ Saint Augustine reports that the Donatists numbered two hundred seventy-nine, and his own colleagues, two hundred eighty-six.²² Counting one hundred twenty absentees and sixty-four sees vacant, the Catholic episcopate then numbered a total of four hundred seventy prelates; and the Donatist returns, although not so complete, point to a figure not much less.²³ Following this conference the Donatist organization declined rapidly, and the Catholic church, aided by the forces of the state, soon assumed the dominant position. A certain number of new bishoprics must have been created, but the completeness of the previously existing, country-wide organization must have kept their number relatively few. The Vandal invasion apparently did not seriously interfere with the administrative scheme of the Catholic church, in spite of various repressive measures, for in the year 480 the Vandal king summoned to a council at Carthage four hundred sixty-six Catholic bishops.²⁴ The geo-

18 *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), pp. 584 ff. The chief of these is the *Notitia Provinciarum et Civitatum Africae* (CSEL, v. 7, pp. 117-134).

19 Ferrère, *op. cit.*, pp. 359-376.

20 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 7, 11, and 31.

21 This disputation was the last attempt of the Catholic episcopate to win the Donatists by an appeal to reason. After it they were wholeheartedly in favor of the suppression of Donatism by the secular power. The conference was ordered by Emperor Honorius, who appointed the Tribune Marcellinus imperial agent and high commissioner. He was a zealous Catholic and friend of Augustine. The conference lasted from June 1 to 8, when Marcellinus declared in favor of the Catholics. He immediately began to enforce the laws against the Donatists, and, excepting for the short time that Marinus was in power, the state officials were henceforth zealous in their work of "reunion."

22 Augustine, *Breviarium Coll.*, 1.14 (PL, v. 43, p. 620).

23 *Gesta Coll. Carth.*, die I, cap. 213-217 (Mansi, v. IV, pp. 163-165); Augustine, *Brev. Coll.* 1.14 and *Ad. Don. Post Coll.*, 24.41 (PL, v. 43, p. 620; p. 676); Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, v. IV, p. 84.

24 *Notitia Provinciarum et Civitatum Africae* (CSEL, v. 7, pp. 117-134).

graphical distribution of the sees may be ascertained by the examination of a list of bishops. Of the five hundred ninety-four dioceses in Ferrère's list, one hundred fifty-three belong to Proconsular Africa, one hundred sixty-one to Numidia, one hundred thirty-four to Byzacenum, ninety-three to Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana, forty-five to Mauretania Sitifiensis, and only seven to Tripolitana.²⁵

Each province was presided over by a primate, an *episcopus primae sedis*,²⁶ but only in Proconsular Africa was there a true metropolitan. The bishop of Carthage was the primate not only of his province but also all Africa.²⁷ In the other five provinces the primacy devolved upon the senior bishop.²⁸ The primatial see, therefore, changed frequently and was often a place of little importance. As in Spain, the title of the primate was *senex*.²⁹ The usual age of the provincial primate may be inferred from the fact that Saint Augustine died at the age of nearly seventy-six in the thirty-sixth year of his episcopate and was not the primate of Numidia. Although a man thus automatically became primate, the Synod of Hippo decreed that the provincial synod must ratify the succession and inform the bishop of Carthage, who was also to decide what measures were to be taken in the event of a contested succession.³⁰ The provincial primate can seldom have been a man of great talent, and his powers, as one would expect, were very modest. His colleagues did not wish him to fall into the sin of pride, and legislated that no primate might be called "prince of priests" or "chief priest" or anything other than *episcopus primae sedis*.³¹ He called and

²⁵ Ferrère, *op. cit.*, pp. 359-376. Leclercq gives for the whole ancient period: Algeria and Tunis (i.e., Proconsularis, Byzacenum, Tripolitana) 373; Algeria (Numidia and Mauretania Sitifiensis) 265; Mauretania Caesariensis 91; Morocco (Tingitana) none. *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. IX (1), pp. 1251-1342).

²⁶ Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. I, can. 4 (Mansi, v. III, p. 919); Augustine, *Ep.* 129, end. (*CSEL*, v. 44, p. 39) Augustine usually refers to the primate as *primas*, *primatus*, or *senex*. See *Epp.* 22.9; 43.8, 9, 14; 59.1, 2; 88.3; 128, end; 141, salutation; 191.1; 196.1; 209.3, 6 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (1), p. 62; v. 34 (2), pp. 90, 92, 96; 219; 220; 409; v. 44, pp. 34; 235; v. 57, pp. 163; 216).

²⁷ Ferrère, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9; Baxter, *Sel. Letters of St. Aug.*, p. 38, n. b; *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 583.

²⁸ Augustine, *Ep.* 59 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 219-220); Leo I, *Ep.* 12 (*PL*, v. 54, pp. 645 f); Gregory I, *Ep.* 74 (*PL*, v. 77, p. 528).

²⁹ Augustine, *Ep.* 22.9; 65, salutation; 128, end; 191.1; 196.1; 209.2, 3 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (1), p. 62; v. 34 (2), p. 232; v. 44, pp. 34; 163; 216; 348); Baxter, *Sel. Letters of St. Aug.*, p. 38, n.b.

³⁰ Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. I, can. 4, renewed by Council of Carthage of 525 (Mansi, v. III, p. 919; v. VIII, pp. 646-647); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 56).

³¹ *Ibid.*, Ser. II, can. 25 (Mansi, v. III, p. 923).

presided over the provincial synod,³² appointed delegates to the Council of all Africa,³³ heard appeals from clerics condemned by their bishops,³⁴ received charges against bishops,³⁵ and issued *litterae formatae* to bishops making a journey to the court or to Rome.³⁶ His greatest dignity, at least in Numidia, was that an ordination of a new bishop was not valid unless he participated.³⁷ Megalius of Calama, primate of Numidia, opposed the election of Saint Augustine as bishop coadjutor of Hippo in 393 and made serious charges which he had to withdraw when he could not substantiate them.³⁸ He then ordained Augustine. When the aged primate died in 397, the bishop of Hippo was moved to write several lines on ill-feeling and its unfortunate effects.³⁹

Occasionally an ambitious bishop sought to usurp the primacy. In 401 Saint Augustine received a summons to a council from a Bishop Victorinus.⁴⁰ The subject of the discussion was to be the primacy of Numidia, which office Victorinus claimed. The date for which it was called was so immediate that Augustine could not depart from Hippo in time to attend it, and illness also made the journey impossible. For more serious reasons, too, he was displeased with the summons, and wrote Victorinus a letter,⁴¹ submitting to his "pious and wise judgment whether certain perplexities which the summons occasioned were due to his [Augustine's] own ignorance or to sufficient grounds." First, the call was addressed to the bishops of the two Mauretaniae in addition to the Numidians. These provinces had their own primates, and when their bishops were invited to Numidian councils it was necessary that the call be signed by several of their most eminent prelates including their primates. Moreover, the letter was addressed to the Numidians in a most confused manner, precedent being entirely disregarded. Augustine's name was third on the list when it

32 Augustine, *Ep.* 59 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 219-220).

33 Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 13; Cf. Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 5).

34 *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 125 (Mansi, v. III, p. 822); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 106.

35 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 6 (Mansi, v. III, p. 920); Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

36 *Ibid.*, Ser. II, can. 27. (p. 923).

37 Augustine, *Ep.* 209 (*CSEL*, v. 57, pp. 347-353); Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 4.

38 Possidius, *Vita Aug.*, 4.

39 Augustine, *Ep.* 38.2 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 65).

40 Augustine, *Ep.* 59 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 219-220).

41 *Ibid.*

should have been much lower, and, most unfortunately, the name of the venerable Bishop Xantippus of Tagosa was omitted. That prelate claimed the primacy and was generally recognized. He regularly issued calls to councils as Victorinus now did. Even supposing that Xantippus and the other bishops might be mistaken concerning his right to the primacy, surely the name of the man most concerned should not have been omitted from the list. For all these reasons the document might well be a forgery. Augustine asked to be excused from attendance on these grounds. Moreover, he asked that Victorinus immediately give his attention to the bringing about of a cordial understanding between Xantippus and himself as to which was the primate of Numidia and had the right to summon the provincial council. The best method might be a council summoned jointly by the two. Then the older bishops who had been in the episcopate almost as long as they themselves could easily determine the seniority, and the younger prelates would then accept their testimony. Either Victorinus withdrew his claim or the bishops decided in favor of Xantippus, for in the next year Augustine reported a judicial decision to the latter as primate of the province.⁴²

This priority was awarded to age and not to talent in order to safeguard the authority of the bishop of Carthage. The provincial primates were not to be rivals of him in prestige, honor, or power. It must have been with this in mind that the Council of Hippo declared that the provincial primates might not be appointed without the knowledge of the bishop of Carthage, to whom they must also give an account of their acts.⁴³ The bishop of Carthage, primate of All Africa, was the unquestioned sovereign of the African church. The aged provincial primates, located at insignificant villages, could never hope to rival him. Saint Cyprian regarded himself as the ecclesiastical lord of Africa,⁴⁴ and in Saint Augustine's day there was no debate concerning the preëminence of that "bishop of more than ordinary influence."⁴⁵ It was considered presumptuous for any church to change anything which Carthage re-

⁴² Augustine, *Ep.* 65 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 232-234).

⁴³ Council of Hippo of 393, canon reenacted by the Council of Carthage of 525 (Mansi, v. VIII, pp. 646-647; briefer form in *Brev. Hippo*, Ser. I, can. 4 in v. III, p. 919); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 56; Dennis, *Hippo Regius*, p. 44.

⁴⁴ Cyprian, *Ep.* 45.3 or Cornelius, *Ep.* 3.3 (*PL*, v. 3, p. 733; v. 4, p. 350).

⁴⁵ Augustine, *Ep.* 43.7 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 90).

tained, and the height of effrontery for any other to wish to persevere in a course which Carthage had condemned.⁴⁶

This reverence for the primatial see of Africa is easily explained. Carthage was the only great city of Africa, and was in every respect the capital of the land. In spite of the mere veneer of Romanization which marked Africa in general, the city was surpassed only by Rome itself as a center of culture and learning in the West. It had been the point of diffusion of African Christianity, and was, therefore, the mother church. Augustine stated that the supremacy of Carthage was due to two factors; the preëminent position of the city in the life of Africa, and its easy communication with the other great cities of the Empire, by which its bishop was able to keep in communion and constant touch with the other Christian capitals, both Rome and those of the East.⁴⁷ Rome, as capital of the West, is specifically mentioned, but the bishop of Hippo certainly does not say that through this connection "something of the prestige and power of Saint Peter's successor attached itself to the metropolitan of Carthage."⁴⁸ The independence and the frequent opposition of the church of Africa towards Rome in a thorn in the flesh of the Roman Catholic historians who try to prove "the preponderance of the Roman Church" in African church affairs.⁴⁹ The archbishop's powers were extensive, and he could say with truth that he bore the burden of all the churches.⁵⁰ As far as possible he visited even the most distant dioceses once a year, and must therefore have been absent from Carthage a large part of the time.⁵¹ He had the right, if he

46 Augustine, *Ep.* 22.4 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (1), p. 58.)

47 Augustine, *Ep.* 43.7 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 90) Tanto magis enim timere debuit (i.e., Secundus), ne pax unitatis violaretur, quanto erat Carthago civitas ampla et illustis, unde se per totum Africae corpus malum, quod ibi esset exortum, tamquam a vertice effunderet. Erat etiam transmarinis vicina regionibus et fama celeberrima nobilis. Unde non mediocris utique auctoritatis habebat episcopum, qui posset non curare conspirantem multitudinem inimicorum, cum se videret et Romanae ecclesiae, in qua semper apostolicae cathedrae vinguat principatus, et ceteris terris, unde evangelium ad ipsam Africam venit, per communicatorias litteras esse coniunctum . . .

48 Ferrère's statement, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

49 Leclercq's phrase, *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 584.

50 *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 55 (Mansi, v. III, p. 746)

51 *Ibid.*, can. 52, 53, 73, 94 (pp. 742, 743, 755, 799); *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 584; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 57; Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 12. He must of necessity have visited several small dioceses, mere congregations in villages and on estates, in a single day. Even with such saving of time, a yearly visit of all the dioceses appears physically impossible when one remembers the other duties of the archbishop, including the administration of his own diocese of Carthage.

saw fit, to transfer a priest from one diocese to another or to ordain him bishop in a place where he was needed.⁵² All primatial elections had to be reported to him,⁵³ and any conflicts arising therefrom were settled by him.⁵⁴ In order that there might be uniformity in the celebration of Easter and the festivals dependent upon it, he fixed the date a year in advance.⁵⁵ Imperial communications to the church of Africa were addressed to him.⁵⁶ Finally, he convoked and presided over the General Council of All Africa, and signed the synodical letters in the name of all.⁵⁷

In spite of his preëminence, the "pope" of Carthage⁵⁸ was not difficult to approach. The priest Augustine, only a year after taking orders, could without impropriety address to Archbishop Aurelius a letter⁵⁹ on the cardinal sins of the African Christians, "rioting and drunkenness," particularly in connection with the veneration of martyrs. He suggested that something be done at once in Carthage, since a beginning would have to be made there. The bishop of Hippo and the Primate Aurelius became close friends, the Carthaginian respecting Augustine for his character and ability, and Augustine ever venerating the metropolitan of the African church, "whom (he) esteemed with the respect due to his worth."⁶⁰ None of Aurelius' letters to Augustine are extant, and only a few remain of those that passed in the opposite direction,⁶¹ but they are sufficient to show that Saint Augustine's independence never suffered through his respect for his superior. He congratulated the archbishop on a progressive step in his diocese,⁶² and in matters of discipline affecting both the diocese of Hippo and that of Carthage or another see in Proconsularis he thought it best to state the facts of the case, add his observations and suggestions, and then to

52 Third Council of Carthage, 397, can. 7 (Mansi, v. III, pp. 928-929); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, v. II, p. 63.

53 Council of Hippo of 393, canon reenacted by Council of Carthage of 525 (Mansi, v. VIII, pp. 646-647; briefer form v. III, p. 919).

54 *Ibid.*; Ferrère, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

55 *Ibid.*; *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. I (1), p. 584; Ferrère, p. 12.

56 Cf. *Ep.* 201 among the letters of Augustine, from the Emperors Honorius and Theodosius to Bishop Aurelius (*CSEL*, v. 57, pp. 296-299).

57 Fifth Council of Carthage, can. 19; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, v. II, p. 72.

58 Augustine, *Ep.* 174, salutation (*CSEL*, v. 44, p. 650); Baxter, *Sel. Letters of Saint Aug.*, p. 302, n.

59 Augustine, *Ep.* 22 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (1), pp. 54-62).

60 Augustine, *Ep.* 64.2 (*CSEL*, 34 (2), p. 230).

61 *Epp.* 22; 41; 60; 174 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (1), pp. 54-62; v. 34 (2), pp. 81-84; 221-222; v. 44, pp. 650-651).

62 *Ep.* 41.

leave the decision to Aurelius.⁶³ He once wrote: "I do not presume to oppose one of your wisdom, rank, and kindliness, and I do hope that you will do what you see to be beneficial for the members of the church."⁶⁴ Aurelius, on his part, commended Saint Augustine's literary work and urged him to devote himself to such tasks.⁶⁵ The primate, for all the prestige of his office, and the entire African episcopate, were overshadowed in world opinion by the bishop of Hippo, whose great abilities and achievements were freely recognized by his contemporaries,⁶⁶ but this fact did not disturb their friendship. Once a bishop whom Aurelius had excommunicated attempted to appeal from the archbishop to Augustine, but the latter merely instructed him in canon law and sent his account of the case to the primate.⁶⁷

Although he was ecclesiastical lord of Africa, the archbishop of Carthage was not the absolute ruler of the church, only its venerated administrative head. The final authority, at one and the same time the legislative body and the highest ecclesiastical court, was the great Council, called by Saint Augustine the Plenary Council of All Africa.⁶⁸ Africa was thoroughly committed to the conciliar system. Each province had its council for the determination of provincial matters, and all united in the general convocation.⁶⁹ To the Africans there was only one authority higher than their synod, and that was an oecumenical council of the whole church.⁷⁰ The need of disciplinary legislation and especially problems presented by the Donatist schism had required frequent councils, and, when Donatism was no longer the matter of first importance, Pelagianism demanded attention. The provincial synods were called and presided over by the provincial primates and the General Council by the archbishop of Carthage. It was decided at the Council of Hippo in 393 and reenacted at the Council of Carthage in 397 that the General Council should be convoked every year

63 *Epp.* 60; 64.3 (v. 34 (2), p. 221-222; 231).

64 Augustine, *Ep.* 60.2 end (v. 34 (2), p. 224).

65 Augustine, *Ep.* 174 (*CSEL*, v. 44, p. 650).

66 Even the emperor thought it proper that letters to the church of Africa be sent both to Aurelius and Augustine. Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 201, end (*CSEL*, v. 57, p. 299).

67 Augustine, *Ep.* 64 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 229-232).

68 *Ibid.*, 4 (p. 231).

69 Occasionally the provincial synods took action of more than local importance, such as the resolutions of the Councils of Proconsularis and Numidia in the Pelagian questions.

70 Clearly demonstrated in the controversy with Pope Zosimus and the attitude which the Africans then showed towards the decrees of Nicaea.

on account of pending cases, which were often prolonged to the injury of the congregations, and that each of the provinces having primates should send three representatives "so that the assembly may be full of authority, but to its hosts less troublesome and less expensive."⁷¹ Because of their poverty the Tripolitanian bishops were required to send only one of their number. In 407 the Council decreed that it should no longer meet every year, but only as necessity demanded.⁷² However, there were always urgent matters, and a year seldom passed without the convocation of the Council.⁷³

The clergy were not exempt from that love of litigation which marked their fellow Africans,⁷⁴ and there was also a constant need of dealing with ecclesiastical offenders, who were not permitted to appear in civil courts.⁷⁵ Therefore, the councils had frequently to legislate concerning judicial procedure and penalties, and to act as courts. Gradually a body of canons accumulated,⁷⁶ and were codified in 419 in the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africae*.⁷⁷

Great care was taken to give the accused cleric every benefit of the doubt. No slave, pagan, heretic, or person of dishonorable condition or reputation could bring charges in an ecclesiastical court.⁷⁸ Priests, deacons, and lesser clergy were first judged by their bishop,⁷⁹ who reported his decision to the provincial primate.⁸⁰ If he desired, the condemned cleric might

71 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 5 (Mansi, v. III, pp. 919-920).

72 Council of Carthage of 407, can. 1 and *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 95 (Mansi, v. III, p. 799); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, v. II, p. 87.

73 The Council convened twice in 408, and once each year in 409, 410, and 411. Since the Donatist question was at last settled, so far as ecclesiastical action was necessary, the Council did not meet again until 416; then twice in 418; once in 419, 421, 422, 423, etc.

74 The period following Easter was a favorite time for litigation. Augustine, *Serm.* 259.6 (*PL*, v. 38, p. 1201).

75 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 9 (Mansi, v. III, pp. 920-921); *Constitutiones Sirmondi*, vi.

76 Cf. Article by Leclercq in *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, v. IX (1), pp. 159-178.

77 Mansi, *Sanctorum conciliorum amplissima collectio*, v. III, pp. 699 ff.

78 *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 129 (Mansi, v. III, p. 826).

79 Augustine, *Ep.* 65 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 232-234). At first it was necessary that the bishop call in five neighboring bishops to assist him in the trial of a priest, and two for the trial of a deacon (Council of Hippo, Ser. II, can. 8), but by 402 the bishop alone apparently tried the accused, and the first appeal was to the neighboring bishops. (Augustine, *Ep.* 65; Sixteenth Council of Carthage, can. 17; *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 125; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 106).

80 *Ibid.*

within a year appeal to six neighboring bishops to hear his case,⁸¹ and from them he could appeal to the primate of the province, and following that to the General Council of All Africa, or directly to that body.⁸² Accusations against bishops were lodged with the provincial primate, who by letter summoned the accused to appear within a month of the day on which he received the notice. If the accused did not appear, he was excommunicated unless he could give good reason for his non-appearance, in which event he was granted another month. After the second month had passed, he might not communicate until acquitted.⁸³ His final hearing was before the General Council, and failure to appear there was considered as a self-imposed sentence of excommunication.⁸⁴ The person who brought the charge had to be present throughout the hearing or the case was dismissed. If bishop or lesser cleric carried his case to a secular court, he was deposed if it were a criminal case, and lost whatever he gained if it were a civil suit.⁸⁵ The civil law, by a dispensation of the emperor, had granted the church the right of disciplining its own clergy.⁸⁶ Sometimes a deposed bishop tried by violent means to gain the possession of his see and then defy the church; and such a case was that of the bishop of Vigésile, whose people refused to accept him again after his deposition. Commenting on this case Saint Augustine expressed his views concerning such prelates:⁸⁷ "No man more effectually reveals the worthlessness of his cause than he who, employing the secular power or any other violent means endeavors by agitating and clamoring to recover the ecclesiastical rank which he has forfeited. For his desire is not to yield to Christ service which He claims, but to usurp over Christians an authority which they disown."

It was a primary rule of the African church that a bishop was to confine his activities to his own diocese. He should not usurp the domain of another, unite a second diocese with his own,⁸⁸ or transfer clergy from elsewhere to his diocese.⁸⁹ Saint

81 *Ibid.*, 2 (p. 233).

82 Sixteenth Council of Carthage, can. 17, or *Cod. Can. Ecc. Afr.*, can. 125 (Mansi, v. III, p. 822); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, v. II, p. 106.

83 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 6 (Mansi, v. III, p. 920).

84 *Ibid.*, can. 7 (p. 920).

85 *Ibid.*, can. 9 (pp. 920-921).

86 Boyd, *Ecclesiastical Edicts of the Theodosian Code*, pp. 92 ff.

87 Augustine, *Ep.* 64.4 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 232).

88 Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. I, can. 2 (Mansi, v. III, p. 919); Augustine, *Ep.* 34.5 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 26).

89 *Ibid.*; Augustine, *Ep.* 64.3; 62 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 231; 224-226).

Augustine informed a correspondent:⁹⁰ "In other towns we deal with matters concerning the Church only so far as the bishops of those towns, our brethren and fellow priests, allow us or enjoin upon us." It was under such circumstances that the bishop of Hippo occasionally took charge of affairs in neighboring dioceses, such as Calama.⁹¹ This rule did not, of course, forbid intercession with a fellow bishop on behalf of a petitioner,⁹² nor was it prohibited to ask privately for an explanation of an act of gross injustice or to bring a public accusation of the same.⁹³ A very young and newly ordained bishop, Auxilius, misused his ecclesiastical power and unjustly excommunicated a certain Classicanus, the proprietor of a manor, and with him his entire family, because he had asked his bishop not to give sanctuary to several unworthy offenders who sought safety in the church. The excommunicated man, frightened by the sad plight of his family, begged Saint Augustine to procure their liberation from the ban. The bishop of Hippo indignantly demanded an explanation from Auxilius.⁹⁴ He himself had never ventured to cut off from the church a whole family for a wrong committed by one of its members, even as much as he was sometimes troubled by "the cruel excesses with which some men have vexed the church," because if he were challenged he could give no satisfactory justification for the act. The young bishop must learn to use his powers properly and begin by cancelling this sentence. At the same time Saint Augustine wrote to Classicanus that he would bring the matter before the Council if necessary, and in order to have the unanimous opinion of the whole western church on this subject he would even write to Rome.⁹⁵ Meanwhile Classicanus need not be troubled by this excommunication if he is truly innocent, for "if any believer has been wrongfully excommunicated, the sentence will do harm rather to him who pronounces it than to him who suffers this wrong." Another instance is that of Paul, who had been trained by Augustine and who then became bishop of Cataqua. For a time his church flourished, but not after power turned his head and he used his resources to bring him temporal gains. He oc-

90 Augustine, *Ep.* 34.5 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 26).

91 Augustine, *Epp.* 91; 104 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 427 ff; 582 ff).

92 Augustine, *Epp.* 64; 219; 250 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 229 ff; v. 57, pp. 428 ff; 593 ff).

93 Augustine, *Epp.* 250; 250 A (*CSEL*, v. 57, pp. 593-598; 598).

94 *Ibid.*

95 Augustine, *Ep.* 250 A (p. 598).

cupied his time so much with things unbecoming his office, and lived on a scale so far beyond his income, that he was fast losing his former adherents and the damage to his church would soon be beyond repair. The bishop of Hippo felt that he was under very special obligations in this instance, and admonished his young colleague at the same time that he broke off communion with him.⁹⁶ Paul replied rather testily. Augustine wrote once more,⁹⁷ addressing his correspondent as "My Brother and Colleague," for, said he, "It cannot be that any bishop whatsoever should cease to be my colleague so long as he has not yet been condemned by any ecclesiastical tribunal." He could not hold communion with Paul, because he could not flatter him. He knew his real abilities, and that is all the more reason that Paul should set his mind on divine things. The Lord had now closed to him all the ways by which he had been making temporal gains in order that He might lead him to the pursuit of that responsibility which had been laid upon him.

Occasionally, in spite of prohibitive canons and custom, a bishop did trespass on the rights of another, and one is surprised to discover such an action on the part of Saint Augustine's intimate friend, Severus, bishop of Milevis, who made a reader of the church of Subsana in the diocese of Hippo deacon against the advice and desire of Augustine, who complained against this irregularity and the bad precedent it set.⁹⁸ Augustine called into conference with Severus and himself the Bishops Alypius of Thagaste and Samsucius of Tures.⁹⁹ The deacon Timothy apparently remained with Severus, since he is later mentioned as the bearer of a letter from Augustine to Severus.¹⁰⁰ Augustine in turn was similarly accused by Quintianus. In this instance it was a reader who was received into the monastery of Hippo. Augustine replied¹⁰¹ that he had not yet done so, but had referred the case to the archbishop of Carthage for decision. He could not understand how a man who had read only once, and then had read uncanonical writings, could be regarded as a reader. Moreover, the canon cited by Quintianus made no mention of monasteries, but laid down the general provision that no one

⁹⁶ This letter and Paul's reply are not extant.

⁹⁷ *Ep.* 85 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 394-395).

⁹⁸ *Epp.* 62; 63 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), pp. 224-226; 226-229).

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* (pp. 224-226).

¹⁰⁰ Augustine, *Ep.* 110.1 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 638).

¹⁰¹ *Ep.* 64.3 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 231).

might receive a clergyman belonging to another diocese unless his bishop agreed.¹⁰² In this respect a recent Council¹⁰³ had enacted a canon that decreed that anyone who deserted a monastery, or one expelled from a religious community, should not be elsewhere admitted either to clerical office or to the charge of a monastery.¹⁰⁴

The collected canons of the Council provided a definite, written constitution for the African church based on a well developed conciliar system. This system gave unity to the church, and enabled it to cope successfully with local problems, such as the Donatist schism, and to oppose effectually the pretensions of foreign power, such as that of Rome. Unfortunately for the western church, this champion of conciliarism was to be weakened by the Vandal invasion and then destroyed by the Islamic conquest.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*; Council of Hippo of 393, Ser. II, can. 19 (Mansi, v. III, p. 920).

¹⁰³ Probably the Council of Carthage of September 13, 401.

¹⁰⁴ Augustine, *Ep.* 64.3 (*CSEL*, v. 34 (2), p. 231).

MINUTES OF THE TWELFTH SPRING MEETING OF THE SOCIETY

March 23-24, 1936

The American Society of Church History held its Spring meeting at Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri, on Monday and Tuesday, March 23 and 24, 1936.

The following members were present: Messrs. Pauck, Knappen, Riddle, Garrison, Petry, C. E. Schneider, Latta, Hoyer, Shoemaker, Kershner, Lyttle, Pershing, Horstmann, W. E. Miller, Wingfield, and Spinka. In addition to the members, twenty-three guests and visitors were present.

The meeting convened in room 103 at 2:30 P. M. and was called to order by the President, Wilhelm Pauck. The first paper was to have been read by Prof. R. E. E. Harkness, of Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania, but he was prevented from travel by the flooded condition in Pennsylvania. Therefore the first paper read was that of Marshall M. Knappen of the University of Chicago, on *William Tindale—First English Puritan*. It was discussed by Messrs. Riddle and Kurtze. Thereupon Albert Hyma of the University of Michigan followed with a paper on *Erasmus and the Oxford Reformers*. This paper was discussed by Messrs. Kershner, Garrison, Riddle, and Petry. The afternoon program was concluded with the reading of a paper by B. H. Pershing of Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, on *The Wittenberg Concord of 1536*.

The meeting thereupon adjourned until 5:30 when the Society and visitors were entertained at dinner in the Seminary refectory. Prof. Carl E. Schneider acted as toastmaster, and Prof. Henry C. Christman, representing the Eden Seminary, spoke a word of welcome.

At 8 o'clock the literary meeting was resumed. Charles Lyttle of the Meadville Theological School, Chicago, read a paper on *Theological Education in New England during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. It was followed by a business session at which the minutes of the previous meeting

were approved as printed in the September, 1935, issue of *Church History*. The president then appointed a nominating committee of Messrs. Spinka, Petry, and Latta.

The morning session of Tuesday, March 24, was presided over by Wilhelm Pauck. He called upon Ray C. Petry of McPherson College, McPherson, Kansas, who presented a paper on *Calvin's Conception of the "societas fidelium."* He was followed by Maurice C. Latta of Olivet, College, Olivet, Michigan, who read a paper on *The Background for the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*. These papers were discussed by Messrs. Kershner, Knappen, Shoemaker, and Spinka. The literary meeting was concluded by the reading of the paper prepared by R. E. E. Harkness on *Religious Principles Represented by Rhode Island*. In the absence of the author, it was read by Dr. Wingfield.

At the business meeting which followed, the nominating committee recommended as members of the Program Committee Messrs. Lyttle, Kershner, and Spinka. Their report was accepted. The nominating committee further recommended and the Society voted that the Research Committee be composed of the following: Messrs. W. W. Sweet, Chairman; C. E. Schneider, J. S. Cornett, M. M. Deems, R. E. E. Harkness, C. H. Moehlman, J. M. Batten, F. W. Buckler, G. A. Riegler, R. H. Johnson, G. J. Fritschel, F. D. Kershner, R. W. Goodloe, P. M. Garber, F. S. Brewer, T. C. Pears, Jr., E. T. Thompson, and S. M. Tenney.

The selection of the place of the next meeting was left to the Program Committee with power to act.

Since a quorum was lacking, the Council was unable to hold a meeting.

After a unanimous vote of thanks to the Eden Theological Seminary for its generous hospitality, the meeting was adjourned.

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Assistant Secretary*.

BOOK REVIEWS

PAPAL PROVISIONS

By GEOFFREY BARRACLOUGH. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. xvi, 187 pages. 10s. 6d.

In recent years there has appeared a constant stream of works dealing with a variety of aspects of the constitutional history of the papacy, based on the documentary evidence of the Vatican rather than the political homiletic and propaganda used so extensively in the last century. The source of inspiration in the English-speaking world is F. W. Maitland, particularly his reply to Stubbs and others, embodied in his *Canon Law in the Church of England*. Within the last five years have appeared Fournier and Bras, *Histoire des Collections canoniques en Occident*, Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy*, Gibbs and Lang, *Bishops and Reform*, W. E. Lunt's monumental *Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages*, to mention only a few. The effect has been to promote a radical re-assessment of the place and working of the papacy in the Middle Ages, and it is bound to modify, to a greater extent than it has done already, the consequent view of the Reformation.

Mr. Barraclough's essay is a further contribution of the same order. The usual approach to the subject of papal provisions has been determined by the views of Grosseteste and others, and the spectacles have been the *Statutes of Provisors* of the reigns of Edward III and Richard II—they constituted a papal usurpation of the first order, whereby bastards and babes were provided with an ecclesiastical alimony. The abuses to which the system of papal provisions could be subject the writer does not attempt to deny. He does, however, show that they were by no means so widespread as it is often imagined. In fact, he produces adequate evidence to show that in the turbulent state of mediaeval feudalism, the papal system of provisions had a very real place in the church's fight against a natural growth of feudal encroachment, whereby the whole of the Western church was in danger of becoming an institution for the maintenance of the minors of baronial houses. The problem, in short, which faced the papacy was the same problem which faced Pseudo-Isidore and the "Gregorian popes."

In the first three chapters, Mr. Barraclough reviews the literature of the subject, concluding his survey with a discussion of the evidence for the local effects of the system, and here he shows that the researches of Stutz, Schulte, Kisky, Leuze and others do not support the broad generalizations on the subject of provisions of their effectiveness. He proceeds to show the strength of lay patrons and the difficulty of procuring the election of really qualified persons to ecclesiastical office. As Z. N. Brooke has shown, that was to Gregory VII the main problem of ecclesiastical administration from which the crisis of the eleventh century

arose, while its continued presence in the thirteenth century has been abundantly illustrated by the works of Miss Gibbs and Miss Lang. The origins of papal provisions are to be found in the petitions to redress these evils where they occur. The procedure was highly technical and by no means as effective in relieving the difficulties as it deserved to be.

"In short, the rules of procedure established a balance between the parties which went some way to safeguard the public interest, and prevented at any rate the most glaring infringements of the established rights either of the ordinary rights of the collators or of the papal providees. It was a system under which justice was done to both parties, no less to the bishops, chapters and patrons whose benefices were in question, than to the providees of the pope, and in which the rules of procedure gave each side ample opportunity for maintaining its proper rights and interests and traversing the claims of its adversary."

It is both unnecessary and impossible here to give the data of the technicalities of the system. For them the reader is referred to the work, particularly chapters viii-xi.

In the final chapter, the author reviews the working of the system in the light of the earlier investigation and the process by which the later popes, finding themselves in possession of powers and precedents, were able to turn them to political advantage. The abuses of the system are well enough known. The benefits that accrued have not received sufficient attention heretofore. They mark a definite phase in the attempt to reform the personnel of the clergy and to raise the welfare of the church above the arena of local feudal interests, and the subject takes the reader to the heart of the problems of mediaeval ecclesiastical administration. Mr. Barraclough is to be congratulated on his contribution, which no student can afford to neglect.

The Graduate School of Theology,
Oberlin College.

F. W. Buckler.

THE PREACHING OF ISLAM

By (SIR) T. W. ARNOLD. Third Edition London: Luzac, 1935. xx, 467 pages. 18s. 6d.

The republication of this classic work, which first appeared forty years ago, places students both of the Muslim world and of Christendom under a debt to Messrs. Luzac and Company. Dr. R. A. Nicholson furnishes a preface, which we wish could have been longer, for Arnold's place in the Cambridge Oriental School's contribution to our knowledge of Islam was high. This work is perhaps most characteristic of his range of knowledge and interest. The student of church history will find in these pages much that will be familiar to him, combined with material concerning which he is too frequently content to remain in ignorance. In this work, Arnold finally dispels the erroneous view that the amazing spread of Islam was due to the sword, by taking each area of Muslim advance and examining the accounts of conversion

in the light of contemporary Christian evidence. Prior to the appearance of *The Preaching of Islam*, stray echoes of suspicion of the validity of the view were abroad, but Arnold was the first to handle the whole field systematically. He is frequently cited, by the less intelligent, as a pro-Muslim writer. That description does not satisfy. Arnold hated all forms of intolerance and unfairness. His antagonism to Christian unfairness is balanced by his attitude toward Ameer 'Ali's *A History of the Saracens*, which he found to be far too favourable a picture. His critical review of Muslim pretensions in *The Caliphate* is sufficient to dispel any such charge.

The book opens with a "Study of the Life of Muhammad Considered as a Preacher of Islam" (chapter ii), and from the Hijaz the author traces "the spread of Islam among the Christian nations of Western Asia." This chapter, together with iv-vi, is indispensable to anyone who wishes to understand the nature of the breakdown of the Christian church before the advance of Islam. The conclusion (chapter xiii), together with two useful appendices (i-ii), completes a picture not likely to prove very satisfying to Christian *autarkeia*. The work is fully referenced, and provided with an exhaustive bibliography and excellent index. It is difficult for the reviewer to express his obligation to or full appreciation of *The Preaching of Islam*. It furnishes the best starting point for any attempt to appreciate the views of the non-Greek subjects of Byzantine Hellenism and the disastrous effects of the policy of Christian unity which emanated from Constantinople.

The Graduate School of Theology,
Oberlin College.

F. W. Buckler.

A YANKEE SAINT

JOHN HUMPHREY NOYES AND THE ONEIDA COMMUNITY

By ROBERTS ALLERTON PARKER. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1935. 322 pages. \$3.75.

The numerous religio-economic communistic experiments which flourished in various parts of the United States during the first half of the last century are just beginning to find adequate interpreters. Many of these experiments are especially interesting as examples of pre-Marxian industrial co-operation and communistic organization. It is a significant fact that the most successful of these experiments had religious origins, which may be somewhat disconcerting to present-day Marxian communists.

If the name of John Humphrey Noyes has been remembered at all, certainly, outside his own followers, no one before has ever thought to call him a saint. Rather he has been called almost everything else except a saint. And yet after reading this book, if one accepts Henri Bergson's characterization of a saint as one whose spiritual energy is transformed into "action, creation, love", then the author seems justified in that characterization of his hero.

Before he was twenty-one years of age, and while still a student at Andover Theological Seminary, John Humphrey Noyes began to rebel against the "cut and dried" professional religion. Finding the atmosphere at Andover too worldly, he transferred to the Theological School at Yale, where he gathered a group of like-minded students and formed an independent church, in which the doctrine of perfectionism was taught. Expelled from Yale and his license to preach withdrawn, after his announcement of his own attainment of sinlessness, Noyes finally (1836) returned to his home in Putney, Vermont, where he succeeded in forming a community, made up largely of members of his own family and neighbors, which he called the "Bible School." Here, in 1846, he instituted a scheme of complex marriage within the bounds of the community, which led to such indignation on the part of outsiders that he was forced to flee to central New York, where in 1848 he established the Oneida Community. Here he was able to develop, during the next thirty years, the most successful of the many American utopias. The economic success of the community was largely based upon the manufacture of steel traps, the community closing its eyes to the excruciating and prolonged pain suffered by the fur-bearing animals caught in them.

Finally (1879) public opinion aroused by such crusaders as Anthony Comstock and Professor J. W. Mears of Hamilton College, aided by the orthodox ministers, compelled the community to conform to the ways of the world. Complex marriage was given up, though an unsuccessful attempt was made to continue as a communistic community, as far as the business and property was concerned. Noyes fled to Canada where he was beyond the reach of legal action. Eventually a remnant of the older members of the community gathered at Niagara where the last years of Noyes were spent in relative comfort.

The teaching of Noyes and the practice of the Oneida Community in regard to sex relations have aroused the principal interest in his experiments. He taught that the first thing to be done to redeem man and reorganize society was to bring about reconciliation with God; the second was to bring about a true union of the sexes. Variety, he contended, is in the nature of things, and is as beautiful in love as in eating and drinking. But it must not be supposed that he advocated lust and license. Rather the relation of the sexes in the community was closely guarded and he attempted to place it on the plane of a sacrament.

University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

WILLIAM PENN AND THE DUTCH QUAKER MIGRATION TO PENNSYLVANIA

By WILLIAM I. HULL. Swarthmore, Pa.: Swarthmore College, 1935.
xiii, 445 pages. \$4.00.

Few religious movements comparable in point of numerical strength with the one originated by George Fox can boast an equal wealth of historical documents relating to their beginnings. The ceaseless travels

of the early Friends in bringing their testimony to high and low and the practice of regular correspondence between their Meetings have combined to produce and preserve this wealth of material which is inviting grateful descendants to its elaboration. The present volume is the second in a series of ten monographs on Quaker history by the same author. The first number of the series, dealing with William Sewel of Amsterdam, the first Quaker historian of Quakerism, came from the press in 1934 and was reviewed in this journal in September of last year.

This second monograph devotes three chapters to William Penn and his mission to Holland and Germany, in the Netherlands, and in the Rhineland, and two to the Dutch and German Quaker migration: the Dutch Quaker founders of Germantown, and the trek to Pennsylvania. The chapters on Penn's continental travels bring illuminating glimpses of the various circles whose affinity with the Friends led him to the hope of drawing converts: the miniature court of Princess Elizabeth of the Palatinate at Herford, the Labadist establishment at Wieuwerd, the followers of Antoinette Bourignon and Poiret, and scattered groups of Pietists and Mennonites. The chapters on the founders of Germantown present material indicative of the fact, that, in spite of its name, Philadelphia's neighbor was settled by Quakers of Dutch rather than of German extraction. Throughout the whole, the religious convictions of Penn and his associates, though in evidence, yield the place of prominence, as is natural, to their colonizing labors and their services in the interest of toleration and of peace.

Seventeen illustrations enrich the volume, including three facsimile reproductions of original manuscripts, besides portraits of de Labadie, A. M. van Schurmann, Antoinette Bourignon, and Princess Elizabeth. The five appendices include Penn's itineraries in Holland and Germany and lists of the Dutch pioneers of Germantown and of its settlers between 1683 and 1709. Numerous letters from various personages that played a role in the story that is being told are reproduced either in full or in part.

Calvin Seminary,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

D. H. Kromminga.

THE CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE

By ROBERT OF CLARI. Translated by EDGAR THOMAS McNEAL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. 150 pages. \$2.75.

This important document, descriptive of the events of the Fourth Crusade and the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, was published for the first time in original old French in 1873. This is the first English translation of the work.

The author, Robert of Clari, was a simple knight serving under Pierre of Amiens in the army of conquest. Thus he was an eye witness to all that concerned the expedition from the time the army gathered in Venice till after the conquest of Constantinople and the disastrous rout of Emperor Baldwin's army before Adrianople. Although in his humble

position he did not have much opportunity to learn personally and directly of the decisions and policies adopted by the leaders, he at least presents such popularized version of the information as reached the ranks of the army. Even then it is remarkable how closely Robert's account tallies with the story of men who had access to the official sources of information, such, for instance, as Villehardouin. On the other hand, Robert was singularly free from bias of any sort, save the indignation a simple knight felt at the greed and unfair dealings of the leaders. Moreover, he used his eyes to far better advantage than the other chroniclers of the Fourth Crusade, and gives us unique descriptions of Constantinople, and shrewd characterizations of men and events which at any rate help us to understand how the rank and file of the army felt about these matters. His naïve and direct narrative style — for Robert dictated his "memoirs"—has a simple charm which a more pretentious account would not possess.

The translation and editing are well done. Altogether, the book is a valuable contribution to the sources of our knowledge of the important episode in history which more than any other single event is responsible for the ultimate downfall of the Byzantine Empire.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

Matthew Spinka.

MEN OF ZEAL

By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. New York: Abingdon Press, 1935. 208 pages. \$2.00.

The subtitle is well chosen — The Romance of American Methodist Beginnings. Fortunately, the author transcends these limitations, for he presents a lucid description and penetrating interpretation of the environmental atmosphere in which the Methodist movement arose and developed. The book is an outgrowth of the Drew Lectureship in Biography. It covers the period from the sixth decade of the eighteenth century through the Revolutionary War into the early national era. The account given is not merely a different version of an oft-told tale but a worthwhile study supplementary to the work already done in this field. New material has been utilized, such as the *Journal* of Thomas Haskins, recently discovered in the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress.

We come into contact with individuals not usually stressed in books of this kind, for instance, that evangelical Episcopal "father-confessor" of early Methodist pioneers, Devereux Jarratt. Indeed, the book presents a phase frequently slighted, namely, the influence and significance of contemporary leaders and forces. In this period so aptly called the "Dark Age of American Christianity," such an approach is especially desirable. The author refrains from taking a dogmatic position on the question of the priority of Methodism's introduction into America. One should like to have had more on this "delicate" subject but perhaps

adequate evidence is lacking upon which to arrive at definite conclusions. He likewise shows keen historical discernment in the matter of Wesley's intentions regarding the establishment of an independent church in America. Here also the evidence appears to be contradictory. The treatise is scholarly, well documented, and readable. It has a splendid bibliography. Garrett Biblical Institute. A. W. Nagler.

ROBERT HAMILTON BISHOP

By JAMES H. RODABAUGH. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1935. 216 pages.

Robert Hamilton Bishop, the subject of this well constructed biography, is an excellent representative of that large group of Presbyterian ministers who exerted the principal cultural and educational influence in the early trans-Allegheny west. Born and educated in Scotland, where he graduated from the University of Edinburgh and the Theological College of his church, the Burger branch of the Associate Synod, Bishop came to America in 1802 in response to the urgent call for ministers on the part of the Associate Reformed Synod. On his arrival he was at once assigned to Kentucky, and in 1803 accepted a call to Ebenezer Church in Jassamine county. The following year he was called to the professorship of moral philosophy, logic, criticism, and belles-lettres in Transylvania University, then just entering upon the period of its greatest reputation. Bishop continued, however, the pastorate of his congregation and was increasingly active in the affairs of his denomination. He became involved in a bitter controversy with Adam Rankin, the stormy petrel of early Kentucky Presbyterianism, and as a result was suspended from the ministry. This led to his withdrawal from the conservative branch of Presbyterianism with which he had been connected and in 1819 he united with the principal Presbyterian body.

Bishop remained on the faculty of Transylvania until 1824 when as a result of a controversy with President Holley, largely growing out of Holley's religious liberalism, an unpleasant situation was created, which caused Bishop to welcome an invitation to the presidency of Miami University. Though chartered in 1809, Miami University did not open its doors to students until the coming of Bishop to the presidency, a position which he retained until 1840. Associated with Bishop on the Miami faculty was the compiler of the famous series of school readers, William Holmes McGuffey, who joined the faculty as professor of languages in 1826. But from Bishop's standpoint McGuffey was far more of a liability than an asset.

While in Kentucky, Bishop had become an active anti-slavery advocate and on coming to Miami University he became one of the principal initiators of the anti-slavery movement in southwestern Ohio, a region not particularly hospitable to the cause. He also took an increasingly active and important part in the controversies which then were going on within Presbyterianism and eventually led to the division of

that great church. When the schism came Bishop, though sympathizing with the New School and deploring the division, for a time identified himself with the Old School party. In 1845, however, he allied himself with the New School, largely as the result of his admiration and friendship for Lyman Beecher.

As a teacher Bishop exercised a powerful and lasting influence over his students. The two great interests of his life came to be the abolition of slavery and the reunion of the Presbyterian church, and in the eventual accomplishment of both, his students were among those who furnished the most effective leadership.

Those of us who are interested in putting religion where it belongs in American history are grateful for such studies as Mr. Rodabaugh has given us.

University of Chicago.

William W. Sweet.

KIERKEGAARD: HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT

By E. L. ALLEN. London: Stanley Nott, 1935. 210 pages.

This is one of the first books in English on the great Danish thinker, Søren Kierkegaard. It is safe to say it will not be the last; both because of certain inadequacies in the treatment, and also because a genius who belongs to humanity and the ages through his endowment, and constitutes an extraordinary spiritual power through his dedication of himself to an ideal task, cannot but become and remain the focus of discussion and influence. As the intensive prosecution of Kierkegaard studies in Germany bears witness, following upon the publication of readable translations of his chief works, the literary movement that Mr. Allen has the honor of launching herewith is bound to develop.

The many-sided Kierkegaardian productivity is in one of its aspects a Theory of Values. It achieves a critical evaluation of human life-attitudes through the poetic and imaginative reproduction of such attitudes, and their mutual confrontation. It illumines with an extraordinary intellectual clarity the life of the spirit in man, the life of hope and joy, despair and dread, passion and aspiration, love and faith. In this field Kierkegaard stands pre-eminent, scarcely having as yet a rival, since these subjective problems have hitherto been shamefully neglected.

Mr. Allen has dealt in detail with Kierkegaard's life, the quiet and externally uneventful life of a student and unattached man of letters. The treatment accorded his ideas is more sketchy. It is true that there was in Kierkegaard an unusually close relationship between life, thought, literary expression; nevertheless, the method adopted by Mr. Allen does less than justice to the originality, the delicate articulation, the sharply defined precision, the scope and reach, and the dialectical fearlessness characterizing that thought.

The book has the merit of an easy journalistic style, and the author has a decided *flair* for the interesting and piquant, of which there is certainly enough in Kierkegaard to endow half a dozen ordinary novelists for life. But a certain lack of sympathy with his subject, an over-reliance upon the criticisms of secondary, very secondary, authorities, a journalistic cock-sureness in snap judgments, have among other things apparently prevented Mr. Allen from learning much of fundamental value from Kierkegaard. He often says "we" and "us" where he should say "I"; thus indicating that he shares the cowardice characteristic of the age in spiritual matters, in that we seek support in the consciousness of being many and modern, and hide like children behind mother's skirts; i. e., behind such neutral objectivities as science and history, from which no view of life can legitimately be deduced.

In one of his rare expressions of self-assertiveness, found in a book prepared for posthumous publication, Kierkegaard says: "I know that I have understood the truth I have expounded." But this does not deceive Mr. Allen; for him he is a "valiant fighter in a cause he did not understand." Thus we see exemplified once more the universal teleology of genius; men of genius are born in order that men of the calibre of Mr. Allen and myself may have the opportunity to set them right.

University of Minnesota.

David F. Swenson

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By WILLIAM WILSON MANROSS. New York and Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1935. xvi, 404 pages. \$2.75.

A readable one volume history of the Protestant Episcopal Church has long been needed. C. C. Tiffany's *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church* was published forty years ago, and S. D. McConnell's *History of the American Episcopal Church*, although it brought the narrative down to 1915 in its revised edition, was far too sketchy to be of much value. Mr. Manross has given us an adequate and, for the most part, an interesting account, based largely on a fresh study of sources, bringing the story down to the present. I say interesting for the most part, for in this respect the book is uneven. It opens with three good chapters on the general development of the church in the colonial period, then in the next four—about a quarter of the book—the same ground is covered, taking up different sections of the country in detail. This is frequently little more than a catalogue of the names of the colonial clergy and the churches and localities in which they ministered. All of which is valuable, but might well have been summarized in an appendix. Again, later in the volume, when the missionary work of the church is chronicled, the record is mainly statistical. The dullness of these chapters is all the more surprising when we discover that Mr. Manross can write in a lively, interesting, even brilliant manner, and with commendable inter-

pretative insight, as he does in the chapters on the struggle for the episcopate, the organization of the church after the Revolution, its extension in the days of Hobart and Griswold, the Oxford Movement, and the more recent liberal tendencies. It is to be hoped that in the not too distant future Mr. Manross and his publishers will give us another edition in which he digests and completely rewrites his statistical material in as admirable a fashion as he has done the rest of the book.

Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. Muller.

THE SPANISH MISSIONS OF GEORGIA

By JOHN TATE LANNING. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1935. 291 pages.

This book is of value both to the student of Hispanic-American history and to anyone who may wish to make an intensive study of the background of English settlement in the seventeenth century. It is commended to those interested in the earliest form of imperial expansion by Europeans into America—that of the Spaniard.

The author has made extensive use of archival materials as found in Madrid, Paris, London, and Mexico City. Probably there are many more than he lists in his bibliography, though it is unlikely that his narrative would have been changed in any important particular had he used all that may exist.

The book recites many circumstances connected with the evangelization of the shifting, elusive, and at times recalcitrant Indian tribes on the Spanish northern frontier. It sets forth, on the one hand, that the Jesuits and the Franciscan friars were strongly imbued with imperialistic ideas. Their devotion to the Spanish kings shows through their efforts to win the Indians to the faith. This is not so much a discovery as a corroboration of what has been ascertained in other regions of Spanish influence. On the other hand, the book brings out distinctly how Spanish governors and other civil authorities were keenly alive to the possibility—even the duty—of evangelizing the Indian in Florida and the contiguous territory. To them it was the surest means of obtaining control over him.

The book throws much interesting light on the northward influence of St. Augustine as a frontier post, continuously held until the English gained the upper hand. The Spaniard had almost two hundred years of uninterrupted sway over the region, and yet had failed to impose his civilization upon the aborigines.

The martyrdom of Father Segura, a Franciscan friar, and his fellow-missionaries, is a touching story of religious devotion in an unsubjugated wilderness. In spite of this the alert Franciscans still clung to the hope of a spiritual conquest of the mainland even down to the opening of the seventeenth century.

The author has uncovered in the course of his narrative many in-

teresting details of the manners and customs of the Indians, besides much that pertains to their political intractability.

The primitive Indian mind could scarcely distinguish between the political and the ecclesiastical official even as late as Altomirano's episcopal visitation in 1606. The Indian of the interior was even less interested in receiving a new religion than was the Indian of the coast region. The effort to win the interior was not made until after Jamestown was settled. Church and state did not work harmoniously; in fact, they were often in open rupture. The state was inclined to urge evangelization even beyond the best judgment of the Franciscan friars.

The only evidences of the Spanish missions in Georgia that now remain are documents, not structures. All of the latter have disappeared. Central Wesleyan College. W. Elden Miller.

MEDIEVAL FRANCIS IN MODERN AMERICA

By ADALBERT CALLAHAN, O. F. M. New York: Macmillan Company, 1936. xv, 494 pages. \$4.50.

The present book despite its sweeping title chronicles the story of but one body of Franciscan Friars, the so-called Province of the Most Holy Name, which with her most northern house at Brookline, Mass. and her most southerly at Asheville, N. C., extends over the east of the United States. The new foundation was begun in 1855 at Allegany, N. Y. by a band of missionaries belonging to many nations, Italians, Dutch, Austrians, and Germans.

The book describes the pastoral, education and social work of the Friars. The material is arranged along chronological lines, combining now and then some events into chapters of biographical or narrative content. The work of the Sisters of St. Francis and the friendly relations with some lay people are related in some chapters.

The first chapter gives a very cursory view of the history of Franciscans in the United States and Canada from 1527 onwards. However, the new movement of Franciscanism crystallized in the Province of the Holy Name has no connection with the work of the Spanish and French Friars. The sole attempt to continue the work of the Spanish Friars in Texas proved abortive after six years' trial.

The author presents his "incomplete and very imperfect narrative" (p. 482) with precision and accuracy. In his digressions, however, on subjects not directly connected with his history he slips occasionally. The remarks on the origin of the Capuchins are positively misleading. Proper names are now and then curiously misspelled. The bibliography is sadly missing. But for a few manuscripts, the narrative is based on printed sources. At any rate the work of Father Callahan is a valuable first attempt to write the story of a body of modern Franciscan Friars.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

John M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.

LUTHERANISM IN BUCKS COUNTY (PA.), 1734-1934.

By ALLEN S. FISHER. Tinicum, Pa.: The author, 1935. viii, 208 pages. \$2.50.

This is another of the growing number of very useful and important works in the field of local history. Here are presented brief, but accurate, sketches of thirty-one Lutheran congregations and factual biographies of one hundred and sixty five Lutheran ministers who have served as pastors of these congregations. Unexpectedly one also finds, as a third part of the work, "A Restudy of the Indians of Eastern United States to More Definitely Prove Lutheran Missions among the Lenape of the Delaware Valley, 1638-1740." This is a convenient summary of generally known material but unfortunately no new information is given tending to "prove" the thesis, although some "predictions" are made of important information later to be revealed. The book is well printed, is profusely illustrated, is well-indexed, and contains adequate citations of authorities. Gettysburg College. Robert Fortenbaugh.

CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

By CHARLES S. MACFARLAND. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. viii, 204 pages. \$1.50.

A review of this volume is a review of reviews, for the book itself consists of reviews of forty-one recent outstanding American books on religion. Dr. Macfarland's editorial work has involved mainly the classification under suitable headings of the reviews he has published in the last year. There are chapters on contemporary theology, New Testament revelation, human salvation, personal and social psychology, the church, etc. The book itself serves two purposes. It gives a swift survey of the contemporary American contribution to literature and religion, for Dr. Macfarland is the honest and leisurely kind of reviewer who presents the content and point of view of a book before he passes judgment on it. Furthermore, it sets the judgment of an incorrigible liberal who is mature enough to pass beyond some of the disillusionment his contemporaries are suffering and keen enough to discern the points of advance.

The Chicago Theological Seminary

Arthur C. McGiffert, Jr.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN TEXAS

By DU BOSE MURPHY. Dallas, Texas: The Turner Co., 1935. 127 pages. \$2.00.

This book is a detailed study, based almost entirely on original documents, of the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Texas.

The beginnings are treated in great detail. The latter parts are less full, though the appendices contain statistical tables that enable one to comprehend the growth of parishes and missions, the increase of communicants, ministers, funds and buildings. The index is very full. Such a concise, factual account is not thrilling reading but sober and slow-moving. There are passages in which the author lets himself go and one *feels* what those pioneer preachers felt. One wishes that there were more; it would make the book of much more general interest. It should not be difficult to make more vivid the heroic lives and labors of the bishops and clergy who laid the foundations during the course of fifty years.

The difficulties faced by the early leaders of Texas Episcopalianism were very great. In addition to those which confronted all church bodies (*e. g.* scattered population, tidal waves that several times destroyed the buildings near the Gulf, poverty, the troubles during and after the Civil War) the Episcopal Church had several of its own, of which Mr. Murphy brings out particularly: how could it minister to the Negroes, how could it secure permanent ministers, how could it overcome the essential congregationalism of the first days. Concerning the second the author quotes from an address of Bishop Kinsolving's in 1925: "How can we secure a ministry that will *stay put*—a ministry which will become domesticated and not continue to imitate the habits of migratory birds?"

This book is a valuable piece of research into one part of the growth of organized Christianity in Texas.

Episcopal Theological Seminary,
Alexandria, Va.

A. C. Zabriskie.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ITALY, 1815-1915

By H. L. HUGHES. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935. 177 pages. 6s.

This little book, written from the Catholic point of view, presents in very readable fashion some of the salient features of Italian religious life in the nineteenth century. Its usefulness as an introduction to the study of Catholic movements during this momentous era of Italy's fortunes will be readily appreciated by all those who are aware of the serious *lacunae* in the literature on that absorbing theme. The chapters on St. John Bosco, Catholic Action, and the emergence of new religious orders serve to illuminate much that is basic in the reaction of the church in Italy against the dominant anti-clericalism and secularism of the time. Of unusual interest is the section on Toniolo, the outstanding representative of the Christian School of Social Science and Leo XIII's adviser on the eve of the promulgation of the famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. The quotations from the verse of Carducci very effectively reinforce the author's appraisal of the great poet as the champion of pagan classicism. There are some suggestive pages on Gemelli and the rise of a neo-Scholastic movement in the peninsula. The treatment of other phases of the subject leaves much to be desired, however. The

delineation of Pius IX's place in the Catholic revival of his day is not sufficiently comprehensive. Manzoni, the celebrated author of *I Promessi Sposi*, receives extended attention, but his significance in the religious evolution of Italy is not convincingly portrayed. Distinctly inadequate is the discussion of such political figures as Cavour and Mazzini whose influence in the sphere of religious thought and action was far-reaching indeed. But these shortcomings are more than counterbalanced by the undeniable merits of the book.

The University of Chicago.

S. William Halperin.